

EMANUEL TOV

Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint

Collected Essays, Volume 3

SUPPLEMENTS TO VETUS TESTAMENTUM [167]

BRILL

Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint

Supplements to Vetus Testamentum

Editor in Chief

Christl M. Maier

Editorial Board

H.M. Barstad – N. Calduch-Benages – D.M. Carr – R.P. Gordon – L.C. Jonker
J. Joosten – G.N. Knoppers – A. van der Kooij – S.L. McKenzie – C.A. Newsom
M. Nissinen – H. Spieckermann – N. Wazana – S.D. Weeks – H.G.M. Williamson

VOLUME 167

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/vts*

Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint

Collected Essays, Volume 3

By

Emanuel Tov



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Tov, Emanuel.

Textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint : collected essays / by Emanuel Tov.
pages cm. – (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, ISSN 0083-5889 ; volume 167)

Includes index.

"Volume 3"—ECIP data view.

ISBN 978-90-04-27013-8 (hardback : alk. paper) – ISBN 978-90-04-28556-9 (e-book)

1. Bible. Old Testament—Criticism, Textual. 2. Dead Sea scrolls. 3. Bible. Old Testament.

Greek—Versions—Septuagint. I. Title.

BS1136.T685 2015

221.4'46—dc23

2014042803

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual “Brill” typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0083-5889

ISBN 978-90-04-27013-8 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-28556-9 (e-book)

Copyright 2015 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi and Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Contents

Preface IX

Sources XI

Abbreviations and Sources XIV

PART 1

Textual Criticism

- 1 Reflections on the Many Forms of Hebrew Scripture in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch 3
- 2 The Coincidental Textual Nature of the Collections of Ancient Scriptures 20
- 3 Some Reflections on Consistency in the Activity of Scribes and Translators 36
- 4 From 4QReworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch (?) 45
- 5 Some Thoughts about the Diffusion of Biblical Manuscripts in Antiquity 60
- 6 The Aramaic, Syriac, and Latin Translations of Hebrew Scripture vis-à-vis the Masoretic Text 82
- 7 Computer-Assisted Tools for Textual Criticism 95
- 8 The Chapter and Section Divisions in Esther 102
- 9 Eclectic Text Editions of Hebrew Scripture 121
- 10 The Literary Development of the Book of Joshua as Reflected in the Masoretic Text, the LXX, and 4QJosh^a 132
- 11 The Scribal and Textual Transmission of the Torah Analyzed in Light of Its Sanctity 154

- 12 Textual Harmonization in the Stories of the Patriarchs 166
- 13 Hebrew Lexicography and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible in
Light of Gesenius' Dictionary 189
- 14 Textual Criticism of Hebrew Scripture and Scripture-Like Texts 205
- 15 The Genealogical Lists in Genesis 5 and 11 in Three Different
Versions 221
- 16 The Textual Development of the Torah 239
- 17 A New Edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch 250
- 18 Review of *Biblia Hebraica Quinta*, vol. 7, Judges 258

PART 2

Qumran

- 19 The Sciences and the Analysis of the Ancient Scrolls: Possibilities and
Impossibilities 267
- 20 Some Thoughts at the Close of the *Discoveries of the Judaean Desert*
Publication Project 289
- 21 A Didactic Approach to the Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls 297
- 22 The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Textual History of the Masoretic
Bible 313
- 23 The Background of the Stichometric Arrangements of Poetry in the
Judean Desert Scrolls 325
- 24 Israeli Scholarship on the Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert
[2011] 337
- 25 The Qumran Hebrew Texts and the Septuagint: An Overview 353
- 26 Scribal Features of Two Qumran Scrolls 368

- 27 The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Proximity of the Pre-Samaritan Qumran Scrolls to the SP 387

PART 3

Septuagint

- 28 Personal Names in the Septuagint of Isaiah 413
- 29 Reflections on the Septuagint with Special Attention Paid to the Post-Pentateuchal Translations 429
- 30 The Septuagint between Judaism and Christianity 449
- 31 The Harmonizing Character of the Septuagint of Genesis 1–11 470
- 32 Genesis 49 in the Septuagint: Trial and Error 490
- 33 The Septuagint Translation of Genesis as the First Scripture Translation 504
- Index of Ancient Sources 521
- Index of Authors 532

Preface

Thirty-three revised and updated essays on the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint, originally published between 2008 and 2014 are presented in this volume, the third volume of my collected writings. While all essays have been reworked—some more, some less—they have all been updated with more recent bibliography.

All three areas have developed much in modern research, and studies written on these topics have many implications for the surrounding disciplines. Among the studies included in this volume are central studies on coincidence, consistency, the Torah, the MT and SP, the diffusion of manuscripts, and the LXX of Genesis.

The names of the three volumes of my *Kleine Schriften* are somewhat confusing. The connoisseur will detect slightly shifting interests, but because the interests themselves have not changed much, the titles bear a resemblance to one another. It would be best to distinguish between the volumes according to their dates (1999, 2008, 2015). In addition, the present volume has "Collected Essays, Volume 3" in its title.

The previous volumes are:

The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint (VTSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999).

Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays (TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

The present one is named:

Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Writings, Volume 3 (VTSup 167; Leiden: Brill, 2015).

The author is indebted to the dedicated staff of Brill publishers, especially Suzanne Mekking and Liesbeth Hugenholtz. The TAT Zetwerk company, especially Laurie Meijers, did marvels with my computer files, making it easier than in the past to create a book from my diverging formats. Thanks are due to the publishers of the original papers, all of whom kindly agreed to their republication in the present volume.

Thanks are due to Gary Knoppers for reading chapter 10 and to Ira Rabin for

reading chapter 19. Or Ben-Zvi helped by skillfully remarking on the content of several chapters. She also expertly read the proofs of chapters 1–5 and the indexes. I thank my son Ariel Tov for scrutinizing the proofs of the remainder with his eagle eyes.

Emanuel Tov

Jerusalem, 31 December 2014

Sources

1. "The Many Forms of Hebrew Scripture: Reflections in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch," in *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of His 65th Birthday* (ed. A. Lange et al.; FRLANT 230; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 11–28.
2. "The Coincidental Textual Nature of the Collections of Ancient Scriptures," *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007* (VTSup 133; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010), 153–169.
3. "Some Reflections on Consistency in the Activity of Scribes and Translators," in *Juda und Jerusalem in der Seleukidenzeit. Herrschaft—Widerstand—Identität: Festschrift für Heinz-Josef Fabry* (ed. U. Dahmen & J. Schnocks; BBB 159; Göttingen: v&R unipress, 2010), 325–337.
4. "From 4QReworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch (?)," in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (ed. M. Popovic; JSJSup 141; Leiden/Boston, 2010), 73–91.
5. "Some Thoughts about the Diffusion of Biblical Manuscripts in Antiquity" in *Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts* (ed. S. Metso et al.; STDJ 92; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 151–172.
6. "The Aramaic, Syriac, and Latin Translations of Hebrew Scripture vis-à-vis the Masoretic Text," in *Εὑχαριστία: Études sur la Bible et ses exégètes, réunies par Mireille Loubet et Didier Pralon en hommage à Gilles Dorival* (ed. M. Loubet & D. Pralon; Paris: Cerf, 2011), 173–185.
7. "Computer-Assisted Tools for Textual Criticism," in *Tradition and Innovation in Biblical Interpretation: Studies Presented to Professor Eep Talstra on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. W.Th. van Peursen & J.W. Dyk; Studia Semitica Neerlandica 57; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2011), 245–260.
8. "The Chapter and Section Divisions in Esther," in *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera, Florilegium Complutense* (ed. A. Piquer Otera & P.A. Torijano Morales; JSSSup 158; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012), 343–360.
9. "Eclectic Text Editions of Hebrew Scripture," in "Go Out and Study the Land" (*Judges 18:2*): *Archaeological, Historical and Textual Studies in Honor of Hanan Eshel* (ed. A. Maeir et al.; JSJSup 148; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 323–333.
10. "Literary Development of the Book of Joshua as Reflected in the MT, the LXX, and 4QJosh^a," in *The Book of Joshua* (ed. E. Noort; BETL 250; Leuven/Paris/Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2012), 65–85.
11. "The Scribal and Textual Transmission of the Torah Analyzed in Light of Its Sanctity," in *Pentateuchal Traditions in the Late Second Temple Period. Proceedings of the International Workshop in Tokyo, August 28–31, 2007* (ed. A. Moriya & G. Hata; JSJSup 158; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2012), 57–72.

12. "Textual Harmonization in the Stories of the Patriarchs," in *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. D. Dimant & R.G. Kratz; BZAW 439; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), 19–50. See <http://www.degruyter.com/>
13. "Hebrew Lexicography and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible in Light of Gesenius' Dictionary," in *Biblische Exegese und hebräische Lexikographie: Das "Hebräisch-Deutsche Handwörterbuch" von Wilhelm Gesenius als Spiegel und Quelle alttestamentlicher und hebräischer Forsummerchung, 200 Jahre nach seiner ersten Auflage* (ed. S. Schorch & E.-J. Waschke; BZAW 427; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), 331–347. See <http://www.degruyter.com/>
14. "Textual Criticism of Hebrew Scripture and Scripture-Like Texts," *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes* (ed. J. Zsanggellér; JSJSup 166; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 183–202.
15. "The Genealogical Lists in Genesis 5 and 11 in Three Different Versions," in *From Author to Copyist: Composition, Redaction and Transmission of the Hebrew Bible: Festschrift Zippi Talshir* (ed. C. Werman; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, forthcoming).
16. "Textual Developments in the Torah," in *3D: Discourse, Dialogue, and Debate in the Bible: For Frank Polak* (ed. A. Brenner-Idan; Hebrew Bible Monographs, 63; Amsterdam Studies in Bible and Religion; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2014), 236–246.
17. Review of A. Tal & M. Florentin, *The Pentateuch. The Samaritan Version and the Masoretic Version* (Hebrew; Tel Aviv: The Haim Rubin Tel Aviv University Press, 2010) in *DSD* 18 (2011): 385–391.
18. Review of *Biblia Hebraica Quinta*, vol. 7, Judges (ed. Natalio Fernández Marcos; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011) in *Sefarad* 72 (2012): 483–489.
19. "The Sciences and the Reconstruction of the Ancient Scrolls: Possibilities and Impossibilities," in: *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures* (ed. A. Lange et al.; VTSup 140/1; Leiden/ Boston: Brill, 2011), 3–25; summary published in *Holistic Qumran: Trans-disciplinary Research of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. Gunneweg, A. Adriaens, and J. Dik; STDJ 87; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 155–162.
20. "Some Thoughts at the Close of the *Discoveries of the Judean Desert* Publication Project," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)* (ed. A.D. Roitman et al.; STDJ 93; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2011), 3–13.
21. "A Didactic Approach to the Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Collection* (ed. P.W. Flint et al.; EJL 30; SBL: Atlanta, 2011), 173–198 and <http://www.sbl-site.org/assets/pdfs/pubs/DSS/Tov.pdf> (illustrations).
22. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Textual History of the Masoretic Bible," in *The*

- Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. N. Dávid et al.; FRLANT 239; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 54–59.
23. “The Background of the Stichometric Arrangements of Poetry in the Judean Desert Scrolls,” in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday* (ed. J. Penner et al.; STDJ 98. Leiden/ Boston: Brill, 2012), 409–420.
 24. “Israeli Scholarship on the Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert [2011],” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective: A History of Research* (ed. D. Dimant; STDJ 99; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 297–313.
 25. “The Qumran Hebrew Texts and the Septuagint: An Overview,” in *Die Septuaginta: Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte* (ed. S. Kreuzer et al.; WUNT 286; Mohr Siebeck; Tübingen, 2012), 3–17.
 26. “Scribal Features of Two Qumran Scrolls” in *Hebrew in the Second Temple Period: The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and of Other Contemporary Sources* (ed. S.E. Fassberg et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 241–258.
 27. “The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Proximity of the Pre-Samaritan Qumran Scrolls to the SP,” in *Keter Shem Tov: Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Alan Crown* (ed. S. Tzoref and I. Young; Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and Its Content 20; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, NJ 2013), 59–88.
 28. “Personal Names in the Septuagint of Isaiah,” in *Isaiah in Context: Studies in Honour of Arie van der Kooij on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. M.N. van der Meer et al.; VTSup 138; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010), 413–428.
 29. “Reflections on the Septuagint with Special Attention Paid to the Post-Pentateuchal Translations,” in *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse. 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.–27.7. 2008* (ed. W. Kraus & M. Karrer; WUNT 252; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 3–22.
 30. “The Septuagint between Judaism and Christianity,” in *Die Septuaginta und das frühe Christentum: The Septuagint and Christian Origins* (ed. T.S. Caulley & H. Lichtenberger; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 3–25.
 31. “The Harmonizing Character of the Septuagint of Genesis 1–11,” in *Die Septuaginta: Text, Wirkung, Rezeption* (ed. W. Kraus & S. Kreuzer; WUNT 325, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 315–332.
 32. “Genesis 49 in the Septuagint: Trial and Error,” in *A Pillar of Cloud to Guide: Old Testament Text-critical, Redactional, and Linguistic Perspectives on the Old Testament in Honour of Marc Vervenne* (ed. H. Ausloos & B. Lemmelijn; BETL 269; Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 455–469.
 33. “The Septuagint Translation of Genesis as the First Scripture Translation,” in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus* (BETL 72; Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 47–64.

Abbreviations and Sources

General Abbreviations

<i>b.</i>	Babylonian Talmud
B.M.	British Museum
Dtr.	Deuteronomistic
LXX	Septuagint translation
LXX*	The “original” text of the LXX reconstructed in the <i>Göttingen Septuagint</i> series or the edition of Rahlfs–Hanhart, <i>Septuaginta</i> as opposed to later revisions that correct the LXX (OG) towards the proto-MT
LXX ^{Luc}	Lucianic tradition (mainly MSS b,o,c ₂ ,e ₂) of the LXX
K	<i>Ketib</i>
KR	<i>kaige</i> -Theodotion revision of the LXX
<i>kaige</i> -Th	<i>kaige</i> -Theodotion revision of the LXX
L	codex Leningrad B19 ^A of MT
<i>m.</i>	Mishna
MT	Masoretic Text
MT ^K	<i>Ketib</i>
MT ^Q	<i>Qere</i>
MT+	Combined evidence of MT, T, v
MT group	Combined evidence of MT, T, v
MT-like	Texts closely resembling MT found at Qumran, distinct from texts reflecting MT found at the other Judean Desert sites.
<i>Mm</i>	<i>Masorah magna</i>
<i>Mp</i>	<i>Masorah parva</i>
OG	Old Greek translation
OL	Old Latin translation of the LXX
P(ap).	Papyrus
Q	<i>Qere</i>
QSP	Qumran Scribal Practice
s	Peshitta (Syriac)
SamJosh	Samaritan book of Joshua
<i>Sof.</i>	Tractate <i>Soferim</i>
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
Sym	Symmachus
<i>t.</i>	<i>Tosefta</i>
T	Targum(im)
Th	Theodotion

T ^j	Targum Jonathan
T ^o	Targum Onqelos
v	Vulgate
y.	Jerusalem Talmud
//	parallel text
[]	reconstructed text
{ }	elements of MT lacking in the LXX (e.g., p. 138)

Bibliographical Abbreviations

The following list contains bibliographical abbreviations of frequently quoted studies. Much additional literature is mentioned in the course of the discussion.

<i>Accordance</i>	<i>Accordance</i> computer program
Aejmelaeus, <i>Trail</i>	A. Aejmelaeus, <i>On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays</i> (revised and expanded edition; Leuven/Paris/Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2007)
ABD	<i>The Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> , vols. 1–6 (ed. D.N. Freedman; New York: Doubleday, 1992)
Barthélemy, <i>Devanciers</i>	D. Barthélemy, <i>Les devanciers d'Aquila</i> (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963)
Barthélemy, <i>Critique textuelle</i> 1992	D. Barthélemy, <i>Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament</i> , 3. <i>Ézéchiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes</i> (OBO 50/3; Fribourg/Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992)
BDB	F. Brown, S.R. Driver, & C.A. Briggs, <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> (Oxford: Clarendon, 1907)
Ben-Hayyim, <i>LOT</i>	Z. Ben-Hayyim, <i>The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic amongst the Samaritans</i> , vols. 1–5 (Heb.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1957–1977)
BHQ	<i>Biblia Hebraica Quinta</i> (ed. A. Schenker et al.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004–), <i>Part 18: General Introduction and Megilloth</i> (ed. P.B. Dirksen et al.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004)
<i>Border Line</i>	<i>On the Border Line: Textual Meets Literary Criticism</i> (Heb.; ed. Z. Talshir & D. Amara; Beer-Sheva XVIII; Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press, 2005)

- Brennpunkt* *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta: Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der griechischen Bibel* (ed. H.-J. Fabry & U. Offerhaus; Stuttgart/Berlin: Kohlhammer, 2001)
- Brennpunkt 2* *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta: Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel, 2* (ed. S. Kreuzer & J.P. Lesch; BWANT 161; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004)
- Brock, *Bibliography* S.P. Brock et al., *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint* (Leiden: Brill, 1973)
- CATSS *Computer-Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies* (Philadelphia/Jerusalem, directed by R.A. Kraft & E. Tov)
- Cross–Talmon, *QHBT* *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (ed. F.M. Cross & S. Talmon; Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 1975)
- Diggers at the Well* *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (ed. T. Muraoka & J.F. Edwolde; Leiden: Brill, 2000)
- DJD II P. Benoit, O.P., J.T. Milik, & R. de Vaux, *Les grottes de Murabba'ât* (DJD II; Oxford: Clarendon, 1961)
- DJD IV J.A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs^a)* (DJD IV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965)
- DJD V J.M. Allegro with A.A. Anderson, *Qumrân Cave 4.I* (DJD V; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968)
- DJD VIII E. Tov with the collaboration of R.A. Kraft, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr) (The Seiyal Collection 1)* (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990)
- DJD IX P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, & J.E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4.IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD IX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1992)
- DJD X E. Qimron & J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.v: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (DJD X; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994)
- DJD XII E. Ulrich & F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers* (DJD XII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994 [repr. 1999])
- DJD XIII H. Attridge et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam, *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (DJD XIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994)
- DJD XIV E. Ulrich & F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (DJD XIV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995 [repr. 1999])
- DJD XV E. Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.x: The Prophets* (DJD XV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997)

- DJD XVI E. Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (DJD XVI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000)
- DJD XVII F.M. Cross, D.W. Parry, R. Saley, & E. Ulrich, *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1–2 Samuel* (DJD XVII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2005)
- DJD XXIII F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar, & A.S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.11: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–30* (DJD XXIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998)
- DJD XXV É. Puech, *Qumran Cave 4.XVIII: Textes hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)* (DJD XXV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).
- DJD XXVII H.M. Cotton and A. Yardeni, *Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek Documentary Texts from Nahal Hever and Other Sites, with an Appendix Containing Alleged Qumran Texts (The Seiyāl Collection II)* (DJD XXVII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997)
- DJD XXVIII D.M. Gropp, *Wadi Daliyeh 11: The Samaria Papyri from Wadi Daliyeh*; E. Schuller et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2* (DJD XXVIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001)
- DJD XXIX E. Chazon et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady, *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XXIX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999)
- DJD XXXII E. Ulrich & P.W. Flint, *Qumran Cave 1.11, Parts 1–2: The Isaiah Scrolls* (DJD XXXII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2010)
- DJD XXXIII D. Pike and A. Skinner, in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady, *Qumran Cave 4 XXXIII: Unidentified Fragments* (DJD XXXIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001)
- DJD XXXVI S.J. Pfann, *Cryptic Texts*; P. Alexander et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD XXXVI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000)
- DJD XXXVII É. Puech, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVII: Textes araméens, deuxième partie: 4Q550–575a, 580–587 et Appendices* (DJD XXXVII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2009)
- DJD XXXVIII J. Charlesworth et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam & M. Brady, *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert* (DJD XXXVIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000)
- DJD XXXIX E. Tov et al., *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (DJD XXXIX; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002)
- DJD XL H. Stegemann and E. Schuller, *Qumran Cave 1.III: 1QHodayot^a, with Incorporation of 1QHodayot^b and 4QHodayot^{a–f}* (trans. of texts by C. Newsom; in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady; DJD XL; Oxford: Clarendon, 2009)

- Dogniez, *Bibliography* C. Dogniez, *Bibliography of the Septuagint = Bibliographie de la Septante 1970–1993* (VTSup 60; Leiden/New York: Brill, 1995)
- Dorival–Harl–Munnich, *Septante* G. Dorival, M. Harl, & O. Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante: Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Paris: Cerf/C.N.R.S., 1988)
- S.R. Driver, *Samuel* S.R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel, with an Introduction on Hebrew Palaeography and the Ancient Versions* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1913)
- DSS after Fifty Years* *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P.W. Flint & J.C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999)
- Eichhorn, *Einleitung* J.G. Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Leipzig: Weidmanns, 1780–1783; 2nd ed.: Leipzig: Weidmanns, 1787 & Reutlingen: Grözingen, 1790; 3rd ed.: Leipzig: Weidmanns, 1803; 4th ed.: Göttingen: Rosenbusch, 1823)
- Eissfeldt, *Introduction* O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament, An Introduction, Including the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and also the Works of Similar Type from Qumran: The History of the Formation of the Old Testament* (trans. P.R. Ackroyd; Oxford: Blackwell, 1965)
- EncBibl* *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vols. 1–9 (ed. E.L. Sukenik et al.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1955–1988)
- Encyclopedia of the DSS* *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman & J.C. VanderKam; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)
- Eshel, “4QDeutⁿ” E. Eshel, “4QDeutⁿ: A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing,” *HUCA* 62 (1991): 117–154
- Flint, *Psalms* P.W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll & the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997)
- Flores Florentino *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst et al.; JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007)
- Florilegium Lovaniense* *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. H. Ausloos et al.; BETL 224; Leuven/ Paris/Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2008)
- Frankel, *Vorstudien* Z. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1841; repr. Westmead: Gregg, 1972)
- Geiger, *Urschrift* A. Geiger, *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Ab-*

- hängigkeit von der innern Entwicklung des Judentums* (2nd ed.: Frankfurt a. Main: Madda, 1928 [Breslau: Heinauer, 1857])
- Gesenius, *Pent. Sam.* W. Gesenius, *De Pentateuchi Samaritani origine indole et auctoritate commentatio philologico-critica* (Halle: Bibliotheca Rengeriana, 1815)
- Gesenius–Kautzsch E. Kautzsch, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1910)
- Ginsburg, *Introduction* C.D. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1897; repr. New York: Ktav, 1966)
- Goshen-Gottstein, *Sample Edition* M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, *The Book of Isaiah: Sample Edition with Introduction* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965)
- Goshen-Gottstein, *HUB, Isaiah* M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, *The Hebrew University Bible: The Book of Isaiah* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1995)
- Goshen-Gottstein–Talmon, *HUB, Ezekiel* M.H. Goshen-Gottstein & S. Talmon, *The Hebrew University Bible: The Book of Ezekiel* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2004)
- HALOT* L. Koehler & W. Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (trans. M.E.J. Richardson et al.; Leiden: Brill, 1994–2000), based on earlier German editions: 1953; 2nd ed.: 1958; 3rd ed.: 1967–1996
- Hendel, *Genesis 1–11* R.S. Hendel, *The Text of Genesis 1–11: Textual Studies and Critical Edition* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)
- Hengel, *Septuagint* M. Hengel, *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon* (Edinburgh/New York: T&T Clark, 2002)
- Jellicoe, *SMS* S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968)
- Kartveit, *Samaritans* M. Kartveit, *The Origin of the Samaritans* (VTSup 128; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2009)
- K.-R. Kim, *Studies* K.-R. Kim, *Studies in the Relationship between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint*, Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1994
- Kutscher, *Language* E.Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1 Q Is^a)* (STDJ 6; Leiden: Brill, 1974)
- de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen* P. de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1863)
- Lange, *Handbuch* A. Lange, *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer, 1: Die*

- Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009)
- Madrid Qumran Congress* *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Madrid, 18–21 March, 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera & L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; Leiden/Madrid: Brill, 1992)
- Martin, Scribal Character* M. Martin, *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1–11 (Bibliothèque du Muséon 44; Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1958)
- Mulder, Mikra* *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. M.J. Mulder; CRINT, Section Two, vol. 1; Assen–Maastricht/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress, 1988)
- Muraoka, Hamlet* *Hamlet on a Hill. Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. M.F.J. Baasten & W.Th. van Peursen; OLA 118; Leuven: Peeters, 2003)
- NAB* *New American Bible* (Paterson, NJ: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1970)
- NETS* *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under That Title* (ed. A. Pietersma & B.G. Wright; Oxford: Clarendon, 2007)
- NJPS* *The Holy Scriptures, The New JPS Translation According to the Traditional Hebrew Text* (Philadelphia/New York/Jerusalem: Jewish Publication Society, 1988; 2nd ed., 1999)
- NRSV* *The Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments with the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books, New Revised Standard Version* (Glasgow/London: Collins, 1989)
- Paul, Emanuel* *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. S.M. Paul et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2003)
- Peters, XIV Congress* *XIV Congress of the IOSCS* (ed. M.K.H. Peters; SBLSCS 59; Atlanta: SBL, 2013)
- Prijs, Jüdische Tradition* L. Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* (Leiden: Brill, 1948; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1987)
- Rabin–Talmon–Tov, HUB, Jeremiah* C. Rabin, S. Talmon, & E. Tov, *The Hebrew University Bible, The Book of Jeremiah* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1997)
- Rahlfs, Septuaginta* A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (Stuttgart: Württemberger Bibelanstalt, 1935)

- Rahlfs–Hanhart, *Septuaginta* A. Rahlfs & R. Hanhart, *Septuaginta, etc.* (2nd ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006)
- RB2 Rabbinic Bible (*Miqraʿot Gʿdolot*) (2nd ed.; Venice: Bompagni, 1524–1525)
- Roberts, *OTV* B.J. Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions: The Hebrew Text in Transmission and the History of the Ancient Versions* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1951)
- Rösel, *Genesis-Septuaginta* M. Rösel *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung: Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta* (BZAW 223; 1994)
- RSV *The Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments, Revised Standard Version* (2nd ed.; New York: Collins, 1971)
- Schenker, *Earliest Text* *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (ed. A. Schenker; SBLSCS 52; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003)
- Schiffman, *DSS* *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L.H. Schiffman et al.; Jerusalem: IES & The Shrine of the Book, 2000)
- Scribal Practices* See Tov, *Scribal Practices*
- Seeligmann, *Isaiah* I.L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* (Mededelingen en Verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap “Example Oriente Lux,” 9; Leiden: Brill, 1948)
- Sperber, *Bible* A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*, vols. I–IVa (Leiden: Brill, 1959–1968)
- Steuernagel, *Einleitung* C. Steuernagel, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament mit einem Anhang über die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1912)
- Swete, *Introduction* H.B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (2nd ed.; Cambridge: University Press, 1914)
- Tal–Florentin, *Samaritan Version* A. Tal & M. Florentin, *The Pentateuch. The Samaritan Version and the Masoretic Version* (Tel Aviv: Haim Rubin Tel Aviv University Press, 2010)
- Talmon, “*Old Testament Text*” S. Talmon, “The Old Testament Text,” in *The Cambridge History of the Bible* (ed. R.P. Ackroyd & C.F. Evans; Cambridge: University Press, 1970), 1.159–199; repr. in Cross–Talmon, *QHBT* (1975), 1–41
- Talmon, *Masada VI* Talmon, & Y. Yadin, *Masada VI: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965, Final Reports, Hebrew Fragments from Masada* (Jerusalem: IES, 1999)

- TCHB* See Tov, *TCHB*
- Thackeray, *Septuagint and Jewish Worship* H.St.J. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (Schweich Lectures 1920; London: Milford, 1921)
- Thackeray, *Grammar* H.St.J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909)
- The Bible as Book* *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. E.D. Herbert & E. Tov; London: British Library & Oak Knoll Press in association with The Scriptorium: Center for Christian Antiquities, 2002)
- Tigay, *Emperical Models* *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (ed. J.H. Tigay; Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1985)
- Tov, *Jeremiah–Baruch* E. Tov, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of Jeremiah 29–52 and Baruch 1:1–3:8* (HSM 8; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976)
- Tov, *TCU* E. Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (2nd ed.; Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997)
- Tov, *Greek-Hebrew Bible* E. Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 1999)
- Tov, “Electronic Resources” 2003 E. Tov, “Electronic Resources Relevant to the Textual Criticism of Hebrew Scripture,” *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 8 (2003) [<http://purl.org/TC>]
- Tov, *Scribal Practices* E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2004)
- Tov, *HB, GB, and Qumran* E. Tov, *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008)
- Tov, “Large-Scale Differences” E. Tov, “The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT s t v, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources,” *ibid.*, 155–170
- Tov, “Early Scrolls” E. Tov, “The Writing of Early Scrolls: Implications for the Literary Analysis of Hebrew Scripture,” *ibid.*, 206–220
- Tov, “Textual Harmonizations Deuteronomy” E. Tov, “Textual Harmonizations in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy,” *ibid.*, 271–282
- Tov, “Three Strange Books” E. Tov, “Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere,” *ibid.*, 283–305
- Tov, *Revised Lists* E. Tov, *Revised Lists of the Texts from the Judaean Desert* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010)

- Tov, *TCHB* E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3rd ed., revised and expanded; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012)
- Tov–Pfann, *Companion Volume* E. Tov with the collaboration of S.J. Pfann, *Companion Volume to The Dead Sea Scrolls Microfiche Edition* (2nd ed.; Leiden: Brill/IDC, 1995)
- Ulrich, *DSS* E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI/Leiden: Eerdmans/Brill, 1999)
- Ulrich, *BQS* E. Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (VTSup 134; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010)
- Walton, *Polyglotta* B. Walton, *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta complectentia textus originales, Hebraicum, cum Pentateucho Samaritano, Chaldaicum, Graecum; versionumque antiquarum, Samaritanae, Graecae LXXII Interpretum, Chaldaicae, Syriacae; Arabicae; Aethiopicae, Persicae, Vulg. Lat. etc.* (London: Roycroft, 1653–1657; repr. Graz, 1965)
- Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis* J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871)
- Young, “Stabilization” I. Young, “The Stabilization of the Biblical Text in the Light of Qumran and Masada: A Challenge for Conventional Qumran Chronology?” *DSD* 9 (2002): 364–390
- Zahn, *Rethinking* M.M. Zahn, *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QRevised Pentateuch Manuscripts* (STDJ 95; Leiden: Brill, 2011)

PART 1

Textual Criticism



Reflections on the Many Forms of Hebrew Scripture in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch

1 Background

In modern society, the Bible has many faces both in Hebrew and in translation, but they all present more or less the same content. Thus *bereshit bara elohim et hashamayim we-et ha-arets* is represented exactly by “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth” (*RSV*) as well as by “Im Anfang schuf Gott Himmel und Erde.” More complicated verses likewise indicate that the Hebrew and European versions represent exactly the same text. The background of this identity lies in the fact that almost all modern translations were made from the very same Hebrew text, namely MT, the traditional text of the Bible as transmitted in Judaism. This text form is well documented, but, strange as it may sound, we still know nothing of its background nor the date of its creation, and it is difficult to define its essence. Probably the most conspicuous feature of MT is its meticulous transmission over the course of a little more than two millennia. The precision with which the Masoretic manuscripts were copied is proverbial, since the copying included the smallest details in the manuscripts such as small dots above letters and the distinction between small and large letters. The rabbis did not allow a manuscript to be used for public reading if there were more than three corrections in one of its columns.¹ It is quite natural that our own evaluation of MT and of the transmission of the Bible as a whole is influenced by this precision.

From the third century BCE onwards, the period covered by the scrolls found at Qumran, MT was the most frequently used text in ancient Israel. This is visible from scrolls from Qumran and the other sites in the Judean Desert as

1 The opinions quoted in *b. Menah.* 29b and *y. Meg.* 1.71c allow for two or three corrections per column (but not four), while the opinions in *Sof.* 3.10 allow for one to three corrections. According to these opinions, scrolls containing a greater number of corrections in a single column could not be used by the public, but according to *b. Menah.* 29b there was a certain leniency with regard to superfluous letters, which were less disturbing when erased or deleted than were added letters. According to these criteria, many of the Qumran biblical scrolls would not have passed the scrutiny of the rabbis, as is evident from a comparison of the average number of corrections with the number of lines per column.

well as the much later rabbinic literature.² At that time, the precursors of MT contained only consonants, but vocalization and cantillation signs were added towards the end of the first millennium, together with the details of the Masorah. The 6,000 medieval manuscripts of MT differed only slightly in all these details. It is a miracle, albeit a man-made one, that the MT remained unchanged over the past 2000 years. This lack of textual intervention is visible when one compares the fragments found at Masada, Naḥal Ḥever, and Naḥal Murabba'at with manuscripts from the Middle Ages. There are almost no differences in consonants between codex L or the Aleppo codex from the early Middle Ages and the texts from Masada, Naḥal Ḥever, and Naḥal Murabba'at; the level of variation between them is no higher than that among the medieval texts themselves.³ A slightly higher level of variation is seen when comparing the medieval text with the Qumran fragments.⁴ Excepting the LXX, all ancient translations, namely the Targumim, Saadyah's Arabic translation, as well as the Peshitta and Vulgate, more or less reflect MT. Rabbinic literature likewise only reflects MT.

The reason for the preponderance of the precursors of MT in this period is evident. Since MT was the text form used by the Temple circles, the Pharisees, and rabbis, it is understandable that all ancient sources after 70 CE reflect this form; many, possibly most, sources preceding the destruction of the Temple also used this text.

Before the destruction of the Temple, however, many additional texts were used in Judaism, and they are the focus of our study. We learn about them from the Qumran discoveries, LXX, and the Torah of the Samaritans, SP. The influence of these texts within Judaism is felt only until the middle of the first century CE. Various developments during that period changed the nature of the textual evidence. These changes were socio-religious and demographic in nature, but are sometimes incorrectly interpreted as relating to the texts themselves. Before the destruction of the Temple, MT was one of the main texts used but not the only one, while after 70 CE it was the only text used in Judaism. The reason for the change was that nascent rabbinic Judaism was the only surviving form of Judaism after that date. There were no other forms of

2 See my analysis "The Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert: An Overview and Analysis," in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 155–170.

3 For precise statistics, see Young, "Stabilization."

4 In "The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues," in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 171–178, I suggested that the texts from the sites other than Qumran reflect the texts named "corrected" in rabbinic literature. These scrolls were corrected on the basis of the Temple copies, while the Qumran texts are one stage removed from them.

Judaism remaining in existence that could have used a different form of the Hebrew Bible. How the pluriformity of the period preceding 70 CE developed into the uniformity of the later period is a matter of debate among scholars.⁵ This development is often described as the 'stabilization' of MT, but in my view the survival of MT as the sole text rather than the preponderant one is merely a result of sociological developments as described above.⁶

After the destruction of the Temple, other biblical texts were in circulation but no longer within Judaism. In the meantime, Christianity had been born, and early Christians used the Greek LXX, which was originally a Jewish translation but had subsequently been adopted by Christianity. Greek-speaking Jews no longer used the LXX, focusing instead on its more recent Jewish revisions. The Samaritans, another group that had split off from Judaism probably in the third century BCE, turned to their own Torah, which was based on a text that had been used previously in Judaism. The practical result of these developments was a division of texts among the religious communities after the destruction of the Temple. The central stream of Judaism held on to the Hebrew MT, most Christians to the Greek LXX, and the Samaritans to their own Hebrew Torah. Whatever texts were in use before that period, such as those known from Qumran, were no longer used since there were no religious groups who could have embraced them.

As a result, archeology and the preservation of ancient religions come to our aid in understanding the textual situation in ancient times. Without the purely coincidental finding of the Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and other sites in the Judean Desert, we would not have known so much about the early text of the Hebrew Bible. Religions come to our aid, too, since Christianity preserved the LXX and the Vulgate, the Samaritan community preserved their own Pentateuch, and traditional Judaism held on to MT.

We mentioned the existence of a pluriform textual tradition before the destruction of the Second Temple. Vestiges of such textual variety are visible

5 For an analysis, see A. van der Kooij, "The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible before and after the Qumran Discoveries," in *The Bible as Book*, 167–177 (170–171).

6 See A.S. van der Woude, "Pluriformity and Uniformity: Reflections on the Transmission of the Text of the Old Testament," in *Sacred History and Sacred Texts in Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of A.S. van der Woude* (ed. J.N. Bremmer and F. García Martínez; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1992), 151–169. Van der Woude believes, as does the present author, that in different circles in Second Temple Judaism, there must have been different approaches towards the text. Most circles did not insist upon a single textual tradition, as is visible in the collection of the Qumran texts. At the same time, a single textual tradition, MT, was held in esteem by the temple circles, and later, the Pharisees. For my own ideas, see *TCHB*, 174–180.

even in modern translations. Thus, against all other translations, the *NRSV* and one of the French African translations include a long section from the Qumran scroll 4QSam^a at the end of 1 Samuel 10. This added section explains the background of the siege of Jabesh Gilead by Nahash the Ammonite,⁷ and thus provides a new context. In this very important detail, the readers of the *NRSV* use a different Bible, one based on novel material from Qumran. Not all scholars agree to this procedure, since some claim that the Qumran paragraph is not original but represents a late Midrash.⁸ Similarly, in Jer 27:1, MT places the framework of the story in the reign of Jehoiakim, while other modern translations, among them the *NRSV*, mention Zedekiah's reign as the chronological setting.

The Bible as represented by the *NRSV* is still the same Bible as in all other translations, in spite of these borrowings from sources other than MT. Even though modern translations usually reflect MT, in several details they represent the LXX, a Qumran scroll, or another ancient source, and through them we get a glimpse of the textual variety in antiquity. This situation makes us increasingly aware that the traditional Jewish text, MT, is *not* the Bible but only one of several text forms and/or representatives, albeit a very good one.⁹

These non-Masoretic text forms are the focus of our study. In some books, MT differs much from the LXX and the SP. These two sources are ancient and modern at the same time. They were created in antiquity, but are still authoritative in modern times. The SP is the Holy Writ of the Samaritan community. The LXX remains the Holy Writ of the Eastern Orthodox Church; while it was authoritative for the whole of Christianity for a long period, it was replaced in the Western Church by the Vulgate. The so-called Apocrypha of the LXX, including such books as Baruch and 1–2 Maccabees, are still part of the Holy Scriptures of the Roman Catholics today, though named deuterocanonical (see further chapter 30 in the present volume).

7 (10:27) Now Nahash, king of the Ammonites, had been grievously oppressing the Gadites and the Reubenites. He would gouge out the right eye of each of them and would not grant Israel a deliverer. No one was left of the Israelites across the Jordan whose right eye Nahash, king of the Ammonites, had not gouged out. But there were seven thousand men who had escaped from the Ammonites and had entered Jabesh-gilead. (11:1) About a month later ...

8 See A. Rofé, "The Acts of Nahash according to 4QSam^a," *IEJ* 32 (1982): 129–133.

9 The edition that bears the misleading name *Biblia Hebraica* should have been named *Biblia Masoretica*. See my study "The Place of the Masoretic Text in Modern Text Editions of the Hebrew Bible: The Relevance of Canon," in *The Canon Debate* (ed. L. McDonald and J.A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 234–251.

We are paying attention to the contents of the LXX because of its acceptance in Second Temple Judaism. For this purpose, we need to understand the nature of the differences between MT and the LXX especially when they pertain to major issues. We exclude from the discussion those LXX books that in our view reflect the translator's own major changes, such as the book of Job, while realizing that this is a subjective decision. Our analysis is thus based on presuppositions that reflect one of several views. If one of these alternative views is more convincing than the one presented here, my own analysis may well be irrelevant. If, for example, someone believes that it was the translator of 3 Kingdoms who created the greatly differing version and not an earlier Hebrew reviser, as I do, the view presented here with regard to that book may be irrelevant. At the end of our analysis, we will turn to matters of text and canon, in an attempt to understand which text forms were authoritative for which communities and why.

2 Major Content Differences between MT and the Hebrew Source of the LXX

We start with a discussion of books in the LXX that differed much from MT. We will not focus on books that presumably contained an edition preceding MT, such as Jeremiah or 1 Samuel 16–18, but rather on three books that show signs of literary editions produced *after* the edition of MT—in our view—: 1 Kings, or as it is named in the LXX, 3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel.¹⁰ In the course of the analysis, we wish to point out some parallels between these three books and Hebrew rewritten Bible compositions from Qumran.

¹⁰ An additional case may be 1 Esdras. However, that book is not a rewritten book like the other compositions discussed in this study, but a new creation based on three different sources, 2 Chronicles 35–36, Ezra 1–10 and Neh 8:1–12, and also contains an additional source in the “Contest between the Three Courtiers” in 3:1–5:3. For a penetrating analysis of the nature of the book, see S. Japhet, “The Picture of the Restoration Period in 1 Esdras,” *Meghillot* 5–6 (2007): 109–128 (Heb.). For a detailed commentary and discussion of the various aspects of 1 Esdras, see Z. Talshir, *1 Esdras: From Origin to Translation* (SBLSCS 47; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1999); eadem, “Synchronic Approaches with Diachronic Consequences in the Study of Parallel Editions,” in *Yahwism after the Exile* (ed. R. Albertz; Studies in Theology and Religion 5; Assen: van Gorcum, 2003), 199–218 = “Synchronic Approaches with Diachronic Consequences in the Study of Parallel Redactions: New Approaches to 1 Esdras,” in *Border Line*., 77–97.

2.1 *3 Kingdoms*

The Greek *3 Kingdoms* differs completely from its counterpart in MT, *1 Kings*, and the background of the relation between the two is a matter of dispute among scholars.¹¹ In my view, the Hebrew composition behind the LXX extensively rewrote the text now included in the MT of *1 Kings*. King Solomon is portrayed as a wise man in MT, but in the first ten chapters of the LXX his wisdom is emphasized more strongly. The LXX reinterprets several of the chapters dealing with Solomon and rearranges various sections, paying special attention to their chronological sequence. Gooding presents the simplest analysis by describing the first ten chapters as being rewritten to emphasize Solomon's wisdom, including the whitewashing of his sins, chapters 11–14 as presenting a more favorable account of Jeroboam, and chapters 16–22 as whitewashing Ahab.¹² The rewriting in *3 Kingdoms* uses the following techniques:¹³

- a. The LXX adds two long *theme summaries* in chapter 2 repeating various verses in *1 Kings* around the theme of Solomon's wisdom, altogether 24 verses (vv. 35a–o and 46a–l). These extensive summaries, repeating verses occurring elsewhere in *1 Kings* 3–11¹⁴ are out of chronological order in chapter 2, since the Solomonic history only starts with chapter 3. These added summaries describe Solomon's marriage to Pharaoh's daughter, his building activities, administration, and offerings, all of them described as exponents of his wisdom. The closest parallel to this technique is the added summary before the LXX of Daniel 5 (see below), although that summary is not a theme summary.
- b. *Duplication* of sections. Beyond the passages mentioned in section a, the rewritten text of *3 Kingdoms* repeated *1 Kgs* 22:41–51 (description of Jehoshaphat's activities) in *3 Kgdms* 16:28a–h, and *1 Kgs* 9:24 in v. 9a of the same chapter in *3 Kingdoms*. To the best of my knowledge, the device of repeating sections is not used elsewhere in the Greek Bible or MT.
- c. Inclusion of an *alternative version*. An alternative history of Jeroboam extant only in the LXX (*3 Kgdms* 12:24a–z) presents a rival story juxtaposed with

11 See E. Tov, "3 Kingdoms Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions," in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst, E. Puech, and E. Tigchelaar; JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 345–366.

12 D.W. Gooding, "Problems of Text and Midrash in the Third Book of Reigns," *Textus* 7 (1969): 1–29.

13 For details, see the paper mentioned in note 11.

14 In vv. 35k–l the MT and LXX contain no parallels.

the original one found in all textual sources including the LXX (1 Kings 11, 12, 14). The technique of juxtaposing two versions of the same story was used from ancient times onwards in the composition of Hebrew Scripture. However, with one exception (1 Samuel 16–18),¹⁵ there is no parallel for the juxtaposition of two alternative versions appearing in one textual witness but not in the other ones.

- d. The *transposition* of verses to other environments in accord with the reviser's tendencies, especially his chronological rearrangements: For example, 1 Kgs 3:1 and 9:16–17 are repositioned as 3 Kgdms 5:14a; 1 Kgs 5:7–8 is repositioned as 3 Kgdms 5:1; 1 Kgs 5:31–32 and 6:37–38 are moved to 3 Kgdms 6:1a–d; 1 Kgs 8:11–12 is placed in 3 Kgdms 8:53a; verses from 9:15–22 are placed in 10:22a–c; etc. This technique is also evidenced elsewhere in the LXX and MT.

The new elements of the LXX are based on a Hebrew text,¹⁶ and this Hebrew text is secondary in relation to MT. It rewrites MT in a way similar to the rewriting in the SP and some Qumran rewritten Bible compositions (see below).

2.2 *Esther*

An evaluation of the differences between Esth-LXX and MT poses many challenges.¹⁷ The LXX is very free and sometimes paraphrastic; it also contains six large narrative expansions (the so-called Additions A–F) that are traditionally considered to be independent units. However, the use of the term 'Additions' gives a false impression of their nature and may lead to wrong conclusions. They are better described as narrative Expansions A–F, adding more than 50 % to the amount of the words of the Greek book.¹⁸

15 In these chapters the originally short story of the encounter of David and Goliath as narrated in the LXX was joined by an alternative story in MT. See my analysis in "The Composition of 1 Samuel 17–18 in the Light of the Evidence of the Septuagint Version," in Tov, *Greek–Hebrew Bible*, 333–360. See further D. Barthélemy et al., *The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism: Papers of a Joint Venture* (OBO 73; Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1986).

16 See the study quoted in note 11.

17 See my analysis "The LXX Translation of Esther: A Paraphrastic Translation of MT or a Free Translation of a Rewritten Version?," in *Empsychoi Logoi: Religious Innovations in Antiquity: Studies in Honour of Pieter Willem van der Horst* (ed. A. Houtman, A. de Jong, and M. Misset-van de Weg; Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 73; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 507–526.

18 Due to the uncertainty pertaining to the *Vorlage* of the LXX, a comparison of the length of the LXX and MT is little more than an exercise. According to the calculations of C.V. Dorothy, *The Books of Esther: Structure, Genre, and Textual Integrity* (JSOTSup 187; Sheffield:

In as far as a consensus exists regarding the textual value of the Greek version of Esther, it is negative¹⁹ because of its free and sometimes paraphrastic translation technique. It should however be recognized that the LXX reflects some Hebrew variants in small details and that the original language of large Expansions A, C, D, and F in the LXX was Hebrew. Further, the Greek translations of the canonical sections and of the Expansions were produced by the same person.²⁰ Esth-LXX thus reflects a rewritten Hebrew composition that included various expansions.

There is no reason to distrust the ancient evidence of all manuscripts according to which all the elements of Esth-LXX represent one integral unit that formed the basis for Josephus, *Ant.* 11:184–296 (including Expansions B–E). We should not be influenced by Jerome's removal of Expansions A–F from their context, thereby mutilating the translation.²¹ His action was arbitrary and inconsistent since by the same token one could excise equally large segments from the Greek translation of 3 Kingdoms 2 and 12, such as mentioned above and place them at the end of the book. Furthermore, the canonical segments and the Expansions are intertwined in an organic way in chapters 4 and 5, making it impossible to mark an uninterrupted group of verses as constituting 'Expansion D'.²² The unity of the canonical text and the narrative expansions is further supported by several close connections in content between the two segments.²³

The following features characterize the rewriting that took place in the Hebrew source of Esth-LXX:

Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 16, the LXX added 77 % to MT, the AT text 45 %, and Josephus 32 %.

19 This judgment was probably best formulated by D.J.A. Clines: "Almost everyone agrees, however, that no matter how free the Septuagint translator has been, it is essentially the Masoretic Hebrew text that was his *Vorlage*" (*The Esther Scroll: The Story of the Story* [JSOT-Sup 30; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984], 69). A similar view had been expressed earlier by T. Nöldeke, "Esther," in *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (ed. T.K. Cheyne and J.S. Black; London: A. & C. Black, 1899–1903), 2:1406: "The tendency, so common at the present day, to overestimate the importance of the LXX for purposes of textual criticism is nowhere more to be deprecated than in the Book of Esther. It may be doubted whether even in a single passage of the book the Greek manuscripts enable us to emend the Hebrew text."

20 See the paper quoted in note 17.

21 W.H. Brownlee, "Le livre grec d'Esther et la royauté divine: Corrections orthodoxes au livre d'Esther," *RB* 73 (1966): 161–185 (162) uses this term.

22 For details, see Tov, "The LXX Translation of Esther."

23 See Tov, "The LXX Translation of Esther." For a different case, see the translation of

1. The addition of large *narrative expansions* at key points in the story: A and F before the beginning and after the end ('Mordecai's Dream' and its 'Interpretation'), and C ('Prayers of Mordecai and Esther') and D ('Esther's Audience with the King') after chapter 4.
2. Probably the most characteristic feature of the LXX is the addition of a *religious background* to the earlier MT version that lacks the mentioning of God's name. These details are added not only in the large expansions but also in small pluses such as 2:20; 4:8; 6:13. Likewise, God's involvement is mentioned everywhere in the Midrash and Targum.²⁴
3. The addition of *new ideas* in small details. For example, the identification of Ahashuerus as Artaxerxes; the description of the first banquet as a wedding feast for Vashti (1:5, 11); the length of the second banquet (1:5); the description of the opulence at the banquet (1:5–6); the identification of Mehuman as Haman (1:10); the king's active participation in the hanging of the two eunuchs (2:23) and of Haman (8:7); the king's placing the ring on Haman's hand (3:10); the naming of Haman as a Macedonian (E 10; 9:24); Esther's concern for her own safety (8:6).

In light of the preceding analysis, we suggest that the *Vorlage* of Esth-LXX included the so-called Expansions A, C, D, and F. The royal edicts in Expansions B and E were probably added by the translator himself.

2.3 *Daniel*²⁵

The relationship between many details in MT and LXX in Daniel 4–6 cannot be determined easily, but most scholars believe that the LXX reflects a later

Daniel that includes several long additions now considered "apocryphal." However, those additions do not form an integral part of the story, as in Esther. Furthermore it is unclear whether there ever existed an expanded Semitic book of Daniel on which the Greek translation would have been based. By the same token, there never existed an expanded Semitic book of Jeremiah that included Baruch even though one translator rendered both Jeremiah and Baruch. See Tov, *Jeremiah–Baruch*.

24 Thus Esther's concern for dietary laws in C 27–28 should be compared with *b. Meg.* 13a, *Targum Rishon*, and *Targum Sheni* 2:20. See B. Grossfeld, *The Two Targums of Esther: Translated with Apparatus and Notes* (The Aramaic Bible 18; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991). For LXX Esth 2:7 "he trained her for himself as a wife" (MT "Mordecai adopted her <Esther> as his own daughter") cf. *b. Meg.* 13a "A Tanna taught in the name of R. Meir: Read not "for a daughter" [*le-bat*], but "for a house" [*le-bayit*] <that is, a wife>." For a different view on the relation between the LXX and the Midrash, see M. Zipor, "When Midrash Met Septuagint: The Case of Esther 2,7," *ZAW* 118 (2006): 82–92.

25 For details in this analysis, see Tov, "Three Strange Books."

reworking of a book resembling MT, while occasionally the LXX reflects an earlier form. Some scholars go as far as to argue that the LXX of Daniel as a whole preceded MT.²⁶ Because of complications like these, the two versions could also be presented as two independent works that revised an earlier composition.²⁷ Be that as it may, in the main, the parent text of the LXX revises an earlier text resembling MT.²⁸ The Semitic substratum²⁹ of the Greek text is often visible.³⁰

Three examples of rewriting in the LXX follow:

- a. A composition very similar to the MT of chapter 4 has been reworked in the LXX. The LXX changed, added, and omitted many details. Among other things, the Greek text places the opening verses of chapter 4 (3:31–33 in MT) later in the chapter, in a greatly expanded form, as v. 34c.³¹ The story in MT

26 Thus R. Albertz, *Der Gott des Daniel: Untersuchungen zu Daniel 4–6 in der Septuagintafassung sowie zu Komposition und Theologie des aramäischen Danielbuches* (SBS 131; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988); O. Munnich, “Texte Massorétique et Septante dans le livre de Daniel,” in *Earliest Text*, 93–120.

27 Thus, according to Ulrich, the *parallel* editions of both MT and the LXX (OG) expanded an earlier text form in different ways: E. Ulrich, “Double Literary Editions of Biblical Narratives and Reflections on Determining the Form to Be Translated,” in *idem*, *DSS*, 40–44. This view was developed on the basis of the Notre Dame dissertations by D.O. Wenthe and S.P. Jeansonne mentioned there.

28 The revisional character of the LXX is described in detail by R. Grelot, “La Septante de Daniel IV et son substrat sémitique,” *RB* 81 (1974): 5–23; *idem*, “La chapitre v de Daniel dans la Septante,” *Sem* 24 (1974): 45–66. J.J. Collins, *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 4–11, 216–220, 241–243 illustrates the relation between the two texts.

29 J.A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1964), 37, 248, argued for an Aramaic substratum, while Grelot, “Daniel IV” assumed a Hebrew parent text.

30 According to Ulrich, *DSS*, 43, the Greek translation was “a consistent, unified document with a consistent translation technique. Therefore, the significant variation between the OG and the MT in 4–6 seems to indicate that the OG is a faithful translation of a different literary edition of these chapters.” If this judgment is correct, we have good insights into the Aramaic parent text of the LXX. Even if this judgment about the translation technique is only partially correct, at least major aspects of the Aramaic text underlying the LXX can be reconstructed.

31 The position of these verses at the end of the Greek chapter is secondary as they refer to the future, although the events themselves have already been described in the preceding verses: “And now, I *will* show to you the deeds that the great God has done with me (v. 34c).” In MT this verse (3:33) correctly appears before the events.

- starts with these verses, which contain the king's confession of guilt and his recognition of God's greatness, while in the LXX they are found at the end of the account in the form of a doxology, as in 6:26–27 and elsewhere.
- b. MT has a tendency to change details in the wording of the dream in chapter 4 to agree with the subsequent description of its interpretation. The LXX goes one step further by reporting the fulfillment of God's command to the king within the dream itself, in the added verse 14a (17a). This long verse, which repeats the wording of the earlier verses, reports the cutting down of the tree and its metamorphosis, now symbolizing the king, into a beast: "He ate grass with the animals of the earth ..." (for the wording, cf. v. 12).
 - c. Preceding the beginning of chapter 5 (King Belshazzar's banquet and the writing on the wall), the LXX adds a summary of the chapter that is neither matched by MT nor Theodotion's version. This summary includes a new element, namely the transliterated inscription written on the wall (v. 25), which is not included in the LXX. The summary partially duplicates the content of the chapter; thus it begins with the same words as v. 1 that introduce the king's feast. There are also differences in details between the summary on the one hand and MT and the LXX on the other. Therefore, this addition must have summarized a slightly different form of the chapter. The underlying text of the summary was probably Aramaic. The summary may be compared to the theme summaries in the LXX of 3 Kingdoms 2 (see above, § 2.1). The summary in Daniel recaps the events told in the chapter, while the LXX of 3 Kingdoms 2 duplicates verses around a common theme.

The essence of the examples given from 3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel is that these Greek books reflect Hebrew compositions that were very different from the ones included in MT. All three rewrote compositions like the ones included in MT, as suggested in greater detail in another study.³² What 4QReworked Pentateuch (4QRP), the Hebrew source of some LXX books, and the SP group have in common is the interaction of stretches of Scripture text and exegetical expansions, although they had different tendencies.

If our analysis so far is correct, the collection of Greek Scripture contained some works that rewrote compositions included in the Hebrew canon (as well as compositions that preceded MT, like in Jeremiah and Ezekiel).

32 See Tov, "Three Strange Books."

3 Comparison of the Three LXX Books with Rewritten Bible Compositions in Hebrew

We now expand our observations on the LXX to other rewritten Bible compositions, in Hebrew, as found among the Qumran scrolls and in the SP group.

The SP group (pre-Samaritan Qumran texts³³ and SP) rewrote a composition like MT. However, the SP goes its own way by adding a very small number of Samaritan sectarian readings.

In addition, some of the Hebrew Qumran compositions likewise resemble the rewriting in the LXX books, even more so than the SP group. The best preserved rewritten Bible texts³⁴ from Qumran are 11QT^a cols. LI–LXVI, the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20), and Jubilees.³⁵ These parallels strengthen our aforementioned assertions relating to the rewriting in some LXX books and reversely the LXX helps us in clarifying the canonical status of the Qumran compositions.

The main feature these compositions and the SP group have in common with the reconstructed sources of the LXX translations relates to the interaction between the presumably original Scripture text and exegetical additions. All the Qumran compositions and the SP group present long stretches of Scripture text, interspersed with short or long exegetical additions.

In the past, the aforementioned three LXX translations have not been associated with the Qumran rewritten Bible texts. When making this link, we recognize the similarity in the rewriting style of Scripture books. More specifi-

33 Especially 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QNum^b; see E. Tov, “Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch,” *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 57–70.

34 For the evidence and an analysis, see G.J. Brooke, “Rewritten Bible,” in *Encyclopedia of the DSS*, 2:777–781; idem, “The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible,” in *The Bible as Book*, 31–40; E. Tov, “Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QParaGen–Exod,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 10; Notre Dame, IN.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 111–134; M. Segal, “Between Bible and Rewritten Bible,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 10–29; D.J. Harrington, “Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Prophecies,” in *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpretations* (ed. R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1986), 242–247.

35 Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities* and Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* also provide valuable parallels, but they are less relevant since they make no claim to sacred status.

cally, the LXX translations meet some of the characterizing criteria that Segal set for rewritten Hebrew Bible compositions: new narrative frame, expansion together with abridgement, and a tendentious editorial layer.³⁶ We now review the similarities in techniques:

3.1 *3 Kingdoms*

Two of the central techniques used in the Greek 3 Kingdoms, not known from MT or other parts of Greek Scripture, were also used in the SP group, viz., the duplication of sections in 3 Kingdoms and the insertion of theme summaries in chapter 2.

- a. *Duplication.* Central to the literary principles of the SP group is the wish to rewrite Hebrew Scripture based on its editorial tendencies without adding new text pericopes. The addition of new passages would have harmed the authenticity of the rewritten Bible compositions, and therefore the SP group limited itself to copying. For this purpose they duplicated, for example, all the segments of Moses' first speech in Deuteronomy 1–3 in Exodus and Numbers as foreshadowers of Deuteronomy.³⁷ In the SP group and 3 Kingdoms, the duplications have a different purpose. In the Greek 3 Kingdoms 2, they serve an exegetical or chronological purpose, while in the SP group the duplication of segments from Deuteronomy in Exodus and Numbers is meant to make the earlier books comply with Moses' speech in Deuteronomy 1–3.³⁸
- b. *Theme summaries.* The two collections of verses in 3 Kingdoms 2 summarize in the beginning of the Greek book verses relating to the central theme of chapters 3–10, namely Solomon's wisdom. By the same token, the added³⁹ tenth commandment of SP (not found in the pre-Samaritan texts) is a theme summary of verses describing the sanctity of Mt. Gerizim. The tenth commandment of SP in both versions of the Decalogue describing and prescribing the sanctity of Mount Gerizim is made up of verses occurring elsewhere in Deuteronomy.⁴⁰

36 Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," 20–26.

37 For a detailed analysis, see Tov, "Rewritten Bible Compositions."

38 A similar duplication is found in 4QDeutⁿ v 5–7 where the motive clause for the Sabbath commandment in Exod 20:11 has been added after the motive clause of Deuteronomy. See J.H. Tigay, "Conflation as a Redactional Technique," in idem, *Empirical Models*, 53–96 (55–57).

39 The Samaritans consider the first commandment of the Jewish tradition as a preamble to the Decalogue, so that in their tradition there is room for an additional commandment.

40 Deut 11:29a, 27:2b–3a, 27:4a, 27:5–7, 11:30—in that sequence.

3.2 *Esther-LXX*

The Hebrew source of Esth-LXX rewrote a composition very similar to MT. The most salient technique used in the course of the rewriting is the addition of the large narrative Expansions A, C, D, and F. These expansions expand the story in a meaningful way. The interaction of the previous Bible text and the long expansions may be compared with the relation between the Qumran rewritten Scripture compositions and their presumed sources. All these rewritten compositions exercise freedom towards their underlying texts by adding large expansions wherever their authors wished.

3.3 *Daniel-LXX*

Two of the techniques used in the Greek Daniel are also used elsewhere:

- a. *Command and execution.* The technique used in the LXX addition in 4:14a (17a), which relates the execution of God's command of vv. 11–14 (14–17), is known from several other compositions. The closest parallel is the story of the Ten Plagues in Exodus 7–11 in the SP group. In this story, the SP group expanded the description of God's commands to Moses and Aaron to warn Pharaoh before each plague by adding a detailed account of their execution.⁴¹ That these additions are not only typical of these texts is shown by the similar addition of the execution of Kish's command to Saul in 1 Sam 9:3 in LXX^{Luc} and the Peshitta.
- b. *Summaries.* The summary description of the events of Daniel 5 that is placed at its beginning reminds us of the theme summaries in 3 Kingdoms 2 and in the SP.⁴²

41 For example, after Exod 8:19, 4QpaleoExod^m and SP, following the formulation of vv. 16 ff. add: "And Moses and Aaron went to Pharaoh and said to him: 'Thus says the Lord: Let my people go that they may worship Me. For if you do not let my people go, I will let loose ...'" Similar additions are found in 4QpaleoExod^m and SP after 7:18, 29; 9:5, 19.

42 The nature of the rewriting has been described in the studies listed in n. 27, but whether the rewriting in 3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel is adequately covered by these descriptions still needs to be examined. Attention also needs to be given to the question of whether or not the rewritten editions were intended to replace the older ones. We believe that this was the intention of the three mentioned rewritten books. The rewritten ed. 11 of Jeremiah (MT) likewise was meant to replace the earlier ed. 1 (LXX, 4QJer^{b,d}).

4 Text and Canon

The rewritten compositions within the LXX canon and the Hebrew texts from Qumran resemble each other with regard to their rewriting procedures and probably also with regard to their canonical position.

The Greek versions of 3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel had an authoritative status following their completion, since all the books of the LXX, including the so-called Apocrypha, probably enjoyed such a status, at first within Judaism⁴³ and subsequently within Christianity.⁴⁴ However, after a few centuries, the Greek Apocrypha were no longer accepted within Judaism. This process probably took place when the LXX books as a whole had been rejected by Judaism, among other things because they had been accepted by Christianity. In the Christian communities, all the books of the LXX, together with the Apocrypha, were accepted as Scripture although not all the details are clear and there are differences between the various traditions. Only much later, with the Reformation, were the Apocrypha relegated to a secondary status. This pertains also to the so-called Additions of Esther and Daniel even though these Expansions never had a separate existence.

While the erstwhile authoritative status of all of the Greek books of the LXX is a fact, the authoritative status of these books in their original languages (Hebrew and Aramaic) is less certain. However, it stands to reason that the Semitic *Vorlagen* of all the books of the LXX, including those of the Apocrypha, once enjoyed authoritative status. The Greek translator of Esther would not have translated the now-apocryphal sections had they not been considered authoritative by him and by the community in whose midst he lived. By the same token, the short book of Baruch was considered authoritative by the translator of Jeremiah, who included it in his translation, and by the Greek reviser who revised the two books.⁴⁵ Likewise, *kaige*-Th rendered Baruch as

43 In actual fact, we have no direct reference in Jewish sources to the Jewish community's acceptance of individual books of Greek Scripture, but I see no reason to distrust the early Church lists such as recorded by Swete, *Introduction*, 203–214 as Jewish Scripture. It is possible that Jewish Greek Scripture encompassed more books such as, for example, Enoch, but the collection probably did not contain fewer books than those included in the lists.

44 In my view, the A-Text of Esther reflects a similar rewritten composition of a text like the MT of that book, but it did not enjoy any authoritative status. See "The 'Lucianic' Text of the Canonical and the Apocryphal Sections of Esther: A Rewritten Biblical Book," in *Greek-Hebrew Bible*, 535–548.

45 See Tov, *Jeremiah-Baruch*.

well as Bel, Susanna and the “Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Young Men” inserted between Dan 3:23 and 3:24. This translator, working in the first century BCE, must have considered these books authoritative.

The hypothesis about the authoritative status of some or all Semitic books, including the Apocrypha, rendered by the LXX translators may also be applied to the Hebrew rewritten Bible compositions from Qumran. We noted above that some of the Qumran rewritten Bible compositions share characteristics with the LXX rewritten books. We may now apply this observation to their canonical status. The rewritten forms of 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel with all their expansions and changes from MT were authoritative in their Greek shape and probably also in their original Semitic forms. Since they share characteristic features with Qumran rewritten Bible compositions, some of the latter also may have enjoyed authoritative status. However, such a status can only be assumed if there was a community that accepted these compositions, and in the case of the Qumran scrolls this assumption is unclear. The fact that several manuscripts of the same composition were found at Qumran does not necessarily imply that they were accepted as being authoritative by that community or any other group. Thus, we do not know of a religious group that accepted the 4–11QTemple, 4QRP, or Jubilees as binding. There is circumstantial evidence for Jubilees as a relatively large number of copies of that book were found at Qumran, and for 4–11QTemple due to the existence of a luxury copy of 4–11QTemple, namely 11QT^a.⁴⁶ The decision is very difficult since no surviving group such as Judaism, Christianity or the Samaritans, has endorsed these compositions.

Because of the lack of convincing evidence relating to all the rewritten compositions, we turn to one group of manuscripts that from the content point of view so closely resembles the rewritten works within Greek Scripture that it probably enjoyed the same authoritative status as the books translated in Greek Scripture. I refer to the manuscripts of 4QReworked Pentateuch, which typologically very much resemble the Semitic source of the LXX books of 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel, since they contain long stretches of unaltered Scripture text as well as small and large exegetical additions and changes. The manuscripts of this group should therefore be considered Scripture to the same extent as the mentioned Greek texts and their *Vorlagen* were considered Scripture. These manuscripts, published as a nonbiblical composition, thus have to be reclassified as different Bible texts.

46 On the surface, it is hard to imagine that 4–11QTemple was accepted as Scripture because its first-person account of the Torah renders it a very artificial work. However, the luxurious character of 11QT^a possibly indicated sacred status. See *Scribal Practices*, 125–129.

The nature of 4QRP is described in chapter 4.

In conclusion, if our analysis is correct, we are faced with many different Scripture texts all of which need to be taken into consideration in the exegetical and literary study of Hebrew Scripture. The meticulously transmitted MT is a given, but beyond that text there were many widely divergent texts within ancient Israel. Among them were several texts earlier than the ones included in MT as well as compositions rewriting a text like MT. In this study, I focused on the rewritten texts incorporated into the LXX (3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel). An early rewritten Bible text, Chronicles, was included in the Hebrew and Greek canon.⁴⁷ Some of these literary reshapings were not accepted by all communities. Thus, some of them made their way to the Jewish LXX translators, but not to the collection of MT. Other texts circulating in ancient Israel made their way to the Qumran community. 4QReworked Pentateuch, to be reclassified as a biblical text (something like “4QPentateuch”), was one such text, about whose authoritative status we have no further information. Maybe it was considered to be authoritative Scripture by the Qumran community or another group.⁴⁸ What 4QRP, the Hebrew source of some LXX books, and the SP group have in common is the interaction of stretches of Scripture text and exegetical expansions, although these expansions differ in nature and tendency. If all these texts were considered authoritative, probably 4QRP enjoyed a similar status. All these texts need to be studied as Hebrew Scripture.

47 Chronicles differs much from Samuel-Kings. Had we found this book at Qumran as an unknown composition, we may have classified it as a rewritten Bible composition.

48 One is reminded of a scribal habit in 4Q364 (4QRP^b) of writing a dicolon (:) before each occurrence of the divine name, followed by a space, serving as a *Qere* note. See *DJD* XIII, 200.

The Coincidental Textual Nature of the Collections of Ancient Scriptures

The theories that have been launched over the past two centuries depict the presumed development of various aspects of the textual transmission, but do not sufficiently clarify diversity of the Hebrew and translational collections. It is probably fair to say that the background of this textual diversity of the authoritative collections included in the MT, LXX and Peshitta remains unknown. An analysis of these data is basic for our understanding of these collections and has implications for our perception of the books that are authoritative in Judaism and in several forms of Christianity.¹ More is known about the background of the Scripture of the Samaritans² and of that of Roman Catholics, incorporating the SP and the Vulgate, since both of them are rather uniform.

Our working hypothesis suggests that these collections, in Hebrew and translation, are often textually inconsistent, unplanned, and therefore haphazard. This is more pronounced in the translations than in the Hebrew MT. We do not claim that the collections show no planning at all. We merely suggest that, in addition to visible elements of planning, we should also recognize many unplanned elements. All these elements together shaped the present textual shape of the authoritative collections. We turn to the textual form of the books included in these canons, not to the selection of the books contained in them.³

The historical question to be posed regarding the textual status of the books included in the authoritative collections is which stage(s) in the textual transmission of these books is (are) reflected in a given collection of sacred writings.

-
- 1 This includes the Scripture of Arameans, Assyrians, Chaldeans, Maronites, and Melkites. See the edition by G. Lamsa, *The Holy Bible from Ancient Eastern Manuscripts* (22nd ed.; Nashville: Holman Bible Publishers, 1981).
 - 2 SP is part of a larger group (the SP group) including several so-called pre-Samaritan Qumran scrolls (4QpaleoExod^m, 4QExod-Lev^f, and 4QNum^b, and secondarily also 4QDeutⁿ and possibly 4QLev^d). See chapter 27 in this volume.
 - 3 Thus, for example, we do not study the question of why Baruch and Ben Sira were included in the LXX canon. The study of the textual features of these compositions can be subdivided into historical and textual-transmissional aspects. Some sound suggestions may be offered, but other aspects remain hypothetical.

From among the many Hebrew texts available in the last centuries BCE, the proto-Masoretic text was chosen as the central text by what may be considered the central stream in Judaism, defined as proto-Pharisees, Pharisees, proto-rabbinic or rabbinic Judaism. MT was selected from among a number of available texts, and at the same time it was shaped by these circles, to a small or great extent,⁴ and perpetuated by them.

However, these historical assumptions do not bring us any closer to understanding the textual nature of MT. That text cannot be defined in textual terms, such as harmonizing, non-harmonizing, close to the original text or remote from it, expansionistic or minimalist, pure or corrupt.⁵ The extant textual theories have not succeeded in illuminating the background of MT to the same degree that, for example, the Qumran scrolls have elucidated the SP. MT forms the basis for explaining the other texts, but its own nature and background remain a mystery.

When turning to the ancient translations, we deal mainly with the shape of the LXX and Peshitta, incorporating the collections of sacred writings in Greek and Syriac.⁶

4 See the examples analyzed by Geiger, *Urschrift* and A. Rofé, "The Onset of Sects in Postexilic Judaism," in *Essays in Tribute of H.C. Kee* (ed. J. Neusner; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 39–49.

5 It is unclear whether the textual status of early books differs in some way from that of the later books. It is possible that the text of the late MT books would be closer to the original form(s) of these books than the text of the early books, since in the latter case a longer time had passed between the last editorial stage and the text frozen in MT. However, that assumption is not necessarily correct. The fact that the early books reflect earlier orthography systems than the late books shows that the spelling systems of the earlier books were updated to a smaller extent than may be expected. By the same token, exponents of late Biblical Hebrew are reflected especially in the late biblical books, while the language of the earlier books has not been updated. See A. Hurvitz, *The Transition Period in Biblical Hebrew, A Study in Post-Exilic Hebrew and Its Implications for the Dating of Psalms* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1972 [Heb.]); R. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose* (HSM 12; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976); M. Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition: The Language of the Book of Ezekiel* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990); R.M. Wright, *Linguistic Evidence for the Pre-Exilic Date of the Yahwistic Source* (London: T&T Clark International, 2005); A. Hurvitz, "Can Biblical Texts be Dated Linguistically? Chronological Perspectives in the Historical Study of Biblical Hebrew," *VTSup* 80 (2000): 143–160. A spectrum of new voices is heard in the subsequent study by I. Young and R. Rezetko, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Text: An Introduction to Approaches and Problems* (London: Equinox, 2008).

6 Our investigations of these collections of authoritative writings would not have been possible without drawing upon an additional source for comparison, the Hebrew, Greek, and Aramaic manuscripts found in the Judean Desert. These texts provide us with many early precursors

Our study pertains to the background of the variety within each of these sources. We suggest that this variety was created at an early stage, in the archetypes of the Hebrew and translational texts. Our working hypothesis is that much coincidence was involved in the inclusion of individual scrolls in these archetypes. In some cases, the lack of planning is visible even in differences between parts of the same book in MT or the LXX, implying that at an earlier stage compositions included in the archetype could have consisted of a number of small or large scrolls, sometimes of a different nature.

We start with the ancient versions. With the exception of Jerome's Vulgate and Saadya Gaon's much later Arabic version, in antiquity all translation projects of Hebrew Scripture were undertaken over the course of several generations. There were no planning committees for the Greek, Syriac, and Aramaic versions. These enterprises simply grew stage by stage. In the case of the Greek Torah, the translation may have started as an official project, but the subsequent Greek translation enterprises were executed by individuals, and this pertains also to the Aramaic and Syriac versions. Some time after the completion of these translations, the archetypes of the present collections of translated Scriptures were composed, again without a master plan. As a result, these collections contained translations of various types, both because there was no quality control and because no other scrolls were available.

1 Septuagint

The group of Greek Scripture texts contained in the collection of the "LXX," such as represented, for example in the critical editions,⁷ represents a heterogeneous group of texts, not only regarding their translation character, but also with regard to their date and status (official as opposed to private). Some of the books included in the "LXX" were added to the Greek corpus only at a late date, usually replacing earlier, freer renderings. For details, see chapter 29 in this volume.

of the medieval texts of the MT, SP, and the Targumim, and of the LXX as represented in manuscripts of the 4–5th centuries CE. At the same time, the Dead Sea Scrolls also provide us with a variety of Hebrew texts for the analysis. For several biblical books the Qumran manuscripts present us with three, four, five, or more different textual forms, differing in small or large details.

7 Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*; the various volumes edited by the Septuaginta Unternehmen: *Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate academiae litterarum gottingensis editum* (Stuttgart: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926–).

The books of the LXX contain an amalgam of several different translations. The clearest case is that of Samuel-Kings. Within these books, 2 Sam 11:1 [10:1?]-1 Kgs 2:11 and 1 Kings 22-2 Kings 25 contain the so-called *kaige*-Th revision. A similar revision is contained in the "LXX" of Ruth, Lamentations,⁸ and Qohelet, the latter ascribed to Aquila.⁹ Likewise, many other units are strikingly diverse.

Four different aspects of this variety are involved:

(1) *Why do the various translation units display different translation styles?* For example, the translation of Joshua is often free, while that of its neighbor Judges in both the A and B texts is rather faithful to their underlying Hebrew texts.¹⁰ The translation of the OG version of 1 Kings (3 Kingdoms) is relatively literal,¹¹ while that of the adjacent 2 Kings (4 Kingdoms) is much closer to its underlying text. The same pertains to other historical books, Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles, which are slavishly literal. Similarly, the Greek versions of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Minor Prophets are rather literal, while the translation of Isaiah is free and in places very free. Similarly, the book of Psalms is presented in a very literal Greek version, while the now adjacent translations of Job and Proverbs are very free and paraphrastic.

In an earlier study I suggested that the discrepancies between these versions reflect the diverse personal approaches of the translators.¹² We did not find a connection between the content of the biblical book and its translation style, nor were we convinced by other explanations of these internal discrepancies. The apparent heterogeneity of these translations or, in modern terms, the lack of guidelines caused Greek Scripture to be a very uneven collection.

(2) *Why does the translation character sometimes change in the middle of a book?* The alternation of different text types in the Greek manuscripts of 1-4 Kingdoms underscores the impression that the present collection of LXX books is an amalgam of different text types, late and early, original and revised.

8 Possibly other sections of the "LXX" collection also contained such a late revision, see Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 34-47.

9 See Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 21-30.

10 In the case of Samuel, that *Vorlage* was often identical to 4QSam^a.

11 The exegetical sections in that translation were probably translated from a Hebrew text deviating from MT. See my study "3 Kingdoms Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions," *Flores Florentino*, 345-366 and see chapter 1 in this volume.

12 "Approaches towards Scripture Embraced by the Ancient Greek Translators," in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 325-338.

The attention of scholars has been directed to the question of why our manuscripts display a mixed text, at times original and at times revised. Thus section βγ of Kingdoms starting in the middle of a book (at 2 Sam 11:2 according to Thackeray [n. 13] and Barthélemy [n. 14]) and ending at 1 Kgs 2:11, contains such a revision. Section γδ starting at 1 Kings 22 contains a revision as well.

As for the *incipit* of section βγ, Thackeray asserted that the OG translation had been purposely omitted by the first translator due to its content (“the story of David’s sin and the subsequent disasters of his reign”) and filled in by a later translator.¹³ Barthélemy likewise suggested that *kaige*-Th retouched only this section because of his interest in its contents.¹⁴ At the same time, Shenkel admitted that “the reason for beginning the KR¹⁵ at 10:1 is not yet apparent.”¹⁶

Similarly, no plausible solution has been suggested why section γδ, starting at 1 Kings 22, contains a revised translation unit. Thackeray again ascribed the change of translation type to theological factors, while Barthélemy, followed by Shenkel, suggested that section γδ started at 1 Kings 22 because the LXX inverted the order of the preceding two chapters 20 and 21.¹⁷ Neither of these theories is convincing, I suggest.

Since previous theories could not explain adequately the alternation of unrevised and revised sections in the manuscripts of the LXX, I suggested that this alternation derived from a purely mechanical factor.¹⁸ The OG translation of Jewish Scriptures required many scrolls, and likewise large books like Samuel–Kings would have been included in several scrolls.¹⁹ I suggest that the archetype of the manuscripts of the Greek 1–4 Kingdoms was composed of scrolls consisting of different translation types,²⁰ probably because the

13 H.St.J. Thackeray, “The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings,” *JTS* 8 (1906–1907): 262–278 (263).

14 Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 141.

15 That is the *kaige*-Th recension. Shenkel started section βγ at 2 Sam 10:1, and not at 11:2, on the basis of textual evidence rather than the contents of the chapters.

16 J.D. Shenkel, *Chronology and Textual Development in the Greek Text of Kings* (HSM 1; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), 118.

17 Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 42; Shenkel, *Chronology*, 63.

18 See Tov, *Jeremiah–Baruch*, 162.

19 This assumption is not supported by Qumran evidence for *Hebrew* scrolls except for the Torah scrolls. See *Scribal Practices*, 181.

20 2 Samuel (2 Kingdoms) was contained in two different scrolls (2 Sam 1:1–11:1 [10:1?]; 2 Sam 11:2 [10:2?]–1 Kgs 2:11). A similar view has now been suggested by Jong-Hoon Kim, “Vom hellenistischen Kleinrollensystem zum Kodex: Beobachtungen zur Textgestalt der griechischen Samuel- und Königebücher,” in Peters, *XIV Congress*, 231–242.

compiler of the archetype was unable to obtain scrolls of the same nature, or was unaware of their mixture.

Likewise, the differences in translation character between the two parts of the LXX of Jeremiah (Jeremiah 1–28; Jeremiah 29–Bar 3:8 according to the LXX) may have been caused by the juxtaposition of two scrolls of a different nature.²¹ The first scroll contained the OG translation, while the second one was revisional. The division point between the two types occurred exactly in the middle of the book according to the sequence of the chapters in the LXX. Similar differences have been spotted between the three segments of Ezekiel (chapters 1–27; 28–39; 40–48).²² The differences between the various parts of these prophetic books are not as dramatic as in the case of 1–4 Kingdoms, yet they are very clear and can only be explained by technical factors such as the juxtaposition of scrolls of a different nature.

The juxtaposition of different scrolls of Samuel–Kings, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel would have occurred in the archetype of the collection of Greek sacred writings, probably in the last century BCE or the first century CE.²³ Also, in the classical world, large compositions were subdivided into independent units (scrolls), often regardless of their content.²⁴

(3) *Why do Greek manuscripts sometimes differ from book to book?* For example, codex Vaticanus preserves the best pre-Hexaplaric text in all Scripture books,

21 See n. 18. My view was not accepted by S. Soderlund, *The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis* (JSOTS 47; Sheffield, 1985), 153–192 on which see the review by J.G. Janzen, “A Critique of Sven Soderlund’s *The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis*,” *BIOSCS* 22 (1989): 16–47; T.S.L. Michael, “Bisectioning of Greek Jeremiah: A Problem to Be Revisited?” *BIOSCS* 39 (2006): 93–104.

22 See H.St.J. Thackeray, “The Greek Translators of Ezekiel,” *JTS* 4 (1902–1903): 398–411; Tov, *Jeremiah–Baruch*, 135–151. On the other hand, P.D.M. Turner, *The Septuagint Version of Chapters i–xxxix of the Book of Ezekiel*, Diss., Oxford University, 1970 believes in the unity of the translation.

23 See Tov, *Jeremiah–Baruch*, 161–168.

24 See Th. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur* (Berlin, 1882; repr. Aalen: Scientia, 1971), 131–140; F.W. Hall, *A Companion to Classical Studies* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), 7–8; F.G. Kenyon, “Book Divisions in Greek and Latin Literature,” in *William Warner Bishop: A Tribute* (ed. H.M. Lydenberg and A. Keogh; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941), 63–76 (especially 73–74); idem, *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1951), 64–70; J. van Sickle, “The Book-Roll and Some Conventions of the Poetic Books,” *Arethusa* 13 (1980): 5–42; H.Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven, Conn. and London: Yale University Press, 1995), 42–66.

while in Isaiah it contains a Hexaplaric text.²⁵ This scribe, like other ones, must have copied from scrolls of a different type.

(4) *Why do the various translation units display different types of Hebrew Vorlage?* Some of the Greek books reflect a text very close to MT, as in the case of the *kaige*-Th sections in Kingdoms. On the other hand, the *Vorlage* of the Greek text of some books differed much from MT. I refer, for example, to the short texts underlying the Greek Jeremiah, Ezekiel and 1 Samuel 16–18. Additional large differences are visible between the MT and LXX of Joshua and Proverbs, Esther and Daniel.²⁶ The reason for these differences is that different individuals translated the books of Greek Scripture at different times from diverse Hebrew scrolls that reflect different stages in the development of the Hebrew books.

The question at stake is not the divergence itself between the Greek and Hebrew books, but rather why these divergences appear in certain books and not in others. Why does the LXX reflect a short text in Jeremiah and Ezekiel and not in its neighbor, Isaiah? Why does the LXX differ so much from MT in Joshua and not in its neighbor Judges? Why does the Greek text differ so much recensionally from MT in Proverbs,²⁷ and not in Psalms or Job. And why does the LXX of Exodus 35–40 differ so much from MT, more so than in any other section of the Torah? In all these cases, we cannot give sound replies. It may be that during the last stage of the development of Hebrew Scripture, the text changed more in these books or in these chapters than in other books or chapters. But it is also possible that the choice of source text made by the ancient translators was often coincidental. Was it a coincidence that a short Hebrew text like 4QJer^{b,d} was chosen for the Greek translation, and not a scroll of the type of 4QJer^{a,c} that is very much similar to MT? I believe that in some cases coincidence was involved. Thus, the translator of the Greek Isaiah chose a manuscript that was close to MT, but possibly at the time of the translation there also existed scrolls of Isaiah that deviated somewhat or much from MT. Such Hebrew scrolls, unknown to us, may have been beyond the reach of the translator of this book. At the same time, I do believe that in some cases the *Vorlage* of the LXX reflects an earlier stage than the archetype of MT.²⁸ As a

25 See J. Ziegler, *Isaías, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate Academiae Litterarum gottingensis editum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), 38–40.

26 For a description, see Tov, “Large-Scale Differences.”

27 I believe that the LXX’s large deviations reflect a recensionally different book. See Tov, “Recensional Differences between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint of Proverbs,” in *Greek–Hebrew Bible*, 419–431.

28 See Tov, “Large-Scale Differences.”

result, we will never know how much coincidence was involved in the choice of Hebrew manuscripts by the Greek translators.

Summarizing this paragraph, much coincidence was involved in the creation of the archetype of the LXX by combining scrolls of various types based on different types of Hebrew scrolls.

2 The Peshitta

The diversity of the translation units in the Peshitta resembles that of the LXX. The Christian community of the East created the Syriac translations based on Jewish sources,²⁹ and chose the books of the Peshitta as their sacred writings. These translation units derived from different circles, as shown in detail by Bloch and Weitzman,³⁰ although the discrepancies between them are smaller than in the case of the LXX.

3 The Targumim

We are faced with several different Targumim for the Torah, two for Esther and Job, as well as single ones for the Prophets and other Writings. These translations vary considerably, ranging from fairly literal to extremely paraphrastic,

29 Some scholars have shown that this translation contains a distinct substratum of Jewish exegesis, especially in the Torah. Y. Maori, *The Peshitta Version of the Pentateuch and Early Jewish Exegesis* (Heb.; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1995) claimed that the translation derived from Jewish-Rabbinic circles. Likewise, M.P. Weitzman, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament: An Introduction* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 56; Cambridge, 1999) suggested that the Peshitta derived from Jewish non-Rabbinic circles. Other scholars claimed that the translation originated within the Christian community; the evidence is reviewed in detail by P.B. Dirksen, "The Old Testament Peshitta," in Mulder, *Mikra*, 255–297 (295), who concludes that "no decisive arguments for either Christian or Jewish authorship have been advanced."

30 J. Bloch, "The Authorship of the Peshitta," *AJSLL* 34–35 (1917–1919): 215–223; Weitzman, *The Syriac Version*, 164–205; "In the Writings, the profiles vary sufficiently to suggest that almost every book has its own translator" (p. 186). "P has been shown to be the work of different translators; the number perhaps lies in the region of fifteen. This diversity, however, is only part of the picture. There is also a network of linking features which unite all the translators, and show them to have been working on the same greater project" (p. 203). "It would be better to view P as the work of a number of different translators, who nevertheless considered themselves colleagues in a single school" (p. 205).

the latter containing collections of midrashim (Esther, Canticles). However, there is a misleading aspect in comparing the variety of the Targumim with that of the LXX and Peshitta since the latter two provide single translations for each biblical book, while the Targumim present us with multiple parallel translations of a different nature. Therefore, when comparing Targumim of the same Scripture book, discrepancies between them are acceptable, because they were created by different individuals.

4 The Masoretic Text

The element of coincidence in the creation of the archetype of MT is slighter than in the case of the mentioned translations because the MT collection was more homogeneous than the collections of authoritative writings in translation and it was more carefully transmitted. Nevertheless, we suggest that also the archetype of MT displays some internal discrepancies that were created by the juxtaposition of scrolls of a different nature. These discrepancies come to light in (4.1) the textual idiosyncrasies of the book of Samuel, (4.2) the special nature of the Elohist Psalter, and (4.3) the special nature of Jeremiah 27–29.

4.1 *Textual Idiosyncrasies of the Book of Samuel*

The frequently corrupt nature of the MT of 1–2 Samuel (as compared with the LXX and 4QSam^a) presents a distinct textual feature. Examples have been provided by a long list of commentators from O. Thenius³¹ and J. Wellhausen³² in the nineteenth century to McCarter³³ and Cross–Parry–Saley³⁴ in modern times, the latter referring especially to 4QSam^a. All these scholars note the many corruptions in MT, but they do not try to explain this situation other than by assuming a faulty scribe. However, we suggest that the book of Samuel in MT was coincidentally more corrupt than the other books, while at the same time this book reflected several theological idiosyncrasies:

31 O. Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuels* (KEH 4; Leipzig: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1842), xxviii–xxix.

32 *Bücher Samuelis*, 16. For a summary of Wellhausen's views, see A. van der Kooij, "De tekst van Samuel en het tekstkritisch onderzoek," *NTT* 36 (1982): 177–204.

33 P.K. McCarter, Jr., *1 Samuel, 11 Samuel* (AB; Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1980, 1984).

34 F.M. Cross, D.W. Parry, R. Saley, E. Ulrich, *DJD* xvii. The statistics of these corruptions are summarized in F.M. Cross and R.J. Saley, "A Statistical Analysis of the Textual Character of 4QSamuel^a," *DSD* 13 (2006): 46–54.

- α. 1–2 Samuel contains many theophoric names originally consisting of *Baal* which were replaced with *boshet*, “shame.”³⁵ These changes form a subgroup of so-called ‘nomistic’ corrections, that is, changes made in accord with the *Torah* (νόμος).³⁶
- β. MT inserted various theological changes in the presumably earlier text of the LXX and 4QSam^a of 1 Samuel 1–2.³⁷ Likewise, the text common to MT and 4QSam^a in 1 Sam 2:9a, lacking in the LXX, represents a theological elaboration on the main theme of the Song of Hannah.³⁸

35 For an analysis, see my *TCHB*, 247–248. For a different view, see M. Tsevat, “Ishboshet and Congeners, The Names and Their Study,” *HUCA* 46 (1975): 71–87; S. Schorch, “Baal oder Boschet? Ein umstrittenes theophores Element zwischen Religions- und Textgeschichte,” *ZAW* 112 (2000): 598–611. These names may be compared with parallels in Chronicles. Even though Chronicles was composed after Samuel, its text often preserves earlier textual traditions. Therefore, this phenomenon pertains to the scribe(s) rather than to the author of the biblical books.

36 These changes have been described by A. Rofé with examples from Samuel in its LXX and 4QSam^a versions, including one example from MT: A. Rofé, “The Nomistic Correction in Biblical Manuscripts and Its Occurrence in 4QSam^a,” *RevQ* 14 (1989): 247–254; idem, “The Piety of the Torah-Disciples at the Winding-up of the Hebrew Bible: Josh. 1:8; Ps. 1:2; Isa. 59:21,” in *Bibel in jüdischer und christlicher Tradition: Festschrift Johann Maier* (ed. H. Merklein et al.; Frankfurt a. M., 1993), 78–85. For earlier analyses, see I.L. Seeligmann, “Researches into the Criticism of the Masoretic Text of the Bible,” *Tarbiz* 25 (1956): 118–139 (Heb. with Eng. summ.)—revised version in *A Biblical Studies Reader* 1 (ed. M. Weinfeld; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1979): 255–278; idem, “Indications of Editorial Alteration and Adaptation in the Massoretic Text and the Septuagint,” *VT* 11 (1961): 201–221. Similar examples from the LXX of Joshua were analyzed by L. Mazon, “A Nomistic Re-working of the Jericho Conquest Narrative Reflected in LXX of Joshua 6:1–20,” *Textus* 18 (1995): 47–62. See also *TCHB*, 254–256.

37 The main difference between MT on the one hand and the LXX and 4QSam^a on the other is that in certain episodes in the latter two texts, Hannah acts as the main character, while in MT there are two main characters, Hannah and Elkanah. The impression is created that MT did not wish to assign certain actions to Hannah since she was a woman, as it would not have been appropriate for a woman to have played such a central role, especially in the cult (see 1:23, 24, 25, 28; 2:11). MT ascribed actions to Elkanah that in an earlier version had been ascribed to Hannah. Also Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuels*, 42 prefers the reading of the LXX in 1:28, arguing that it would not make sense for the Greek text to suppress the involvement of Elkanah, which has been mentioned in detail in v. 24. Especially difficult is 2:11 in MT: since, at this juncture, Hannah should be considered the main character, it is strange that nothing is said in this verse about her movements. It is thus likely that some statements about Elkanah replaced earlier elements.

38 That addition to the original text reinterprets in a certain way the examples of the changes in the fate of the individual given in vv. 4–8. According to this reinterpretation, the sudden

γ. The MT of Samuel shows additional signs of theological reworking.³⁹ Samuel holds a special place in MT as shown by the mentioned unrelated features, its frequently corrupt nature and its theological tendencies. The scroll that was included in the archetype of MT coincidentally was somewhat corrupt. However, its other features were not coincidental, since MT's theological changes characterized the persons who created the last stage of that book. The theological editing was probably inserted in a somewhat corrupt scroll before it was included in the collection of sacred writings, because otherwise we do not know why Samuel underwent more extensive theological editing in MT than the average biblical book, while this book does not provide more occasions for such changes than other books.

4.2 *The Special Position of the Elohistc Psalter*

The background of the special status of the second and the greater part of the third book of Psalms has not been clarified. In these two Psalter books, *elohim* is the dominant divine name, while in the other three Psalter books *YHWH* is the main appellation for God.⁴⁰ This pertains to Psalms 42–72 (book 2) and Psalms 73–89 (book 3).⁴¹ The differences are most clearly visible in the parallel Psalms

changes described in those verses do not exemplify the strength of God, but the power of loyalty to God. It is the person who is loyal to God who will experience an improvement in his condition, and it is the wicked person (that is, the one who is not loyal to God) who will experience a deterioration in his condition. This reinterpretation found in MT and 4QSam^a of v. 9a was probably added after the completion of the MT text of the Song. For an understanding of the background of this verse, it is important to note that the specific use of רשע, “wicked,” as describing persons who are disloyal to God, occurs mainly in Ezekiel, Psalms and the Wisdom literature. It was the intention of the person who added v. 9a that the contents of this verse would be applied to vv. 4–8.

39 For example, 1 Sam 2:22 MT as opposed to the LXX and 4QSam^a.

40 The following statistics are provided by J. Day, *Psalms* (OTG; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 114: Psalms 1–41 *YHWH* 278×, *elohim* 15×; Psalms 42–83 *YHWH* 44×, *elohim* 200×; Psalms 84–89 *YHWH* 31×, *elohim* 7×; Psalms 90–150 *YHWH* 339×, *elohim* 6×.

41 Probably Psalms 84–89, all or in part, have not been submitted to this revision (see n. 40). However, according to Gese, Psalm 84 belongs to the Elohistc Psalter: H. Gese, “Die Entstehung der Büchereinteilung des Psalters,” in idem, *Vom Sinai zum Zion: Alttestamentliche Beiträge zur biblischen Theologie* (Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 64; München: Kaiser, 1974), 159–167 (162). According to BDB, 44, Psalms 84–85 are Elohistc, and according to L. Joffe, “The Elohistc Psalter: What, How, and Why?”, *SJOT* 15 (2001): 142–169 (169) all these Psalms (84–89) contained the Elohistc Psalter. According to H.-J. Kraus, *Psalmen I* (Neukirchen-Vluyn; Neukirchener Verlag, 1966), xvi these six Psalms were added to the Elohistc Psalter after that had been completed.

14 and 53 where the formulation of Ps 53:3–7 strongly suggests that the Elohistic Psalter replaced the earlier *YHWH* with *elohim*.⁴² The usual explanation given for the wording of the Elohistic Psalter is the shunning away from the use of the Tetragrammaton,⁴³ a feature that is also noticeable in various scribal practices in the Qumran scrolls.⁴⁴ The replacement of *YHWH* with *elohim* in the Elohistic Psalms was not complete, however, since forty-three occurrences of that name were overlooked by the reviser. This oversight caused Goulder to doubt the very assumption of revisional activity,⁴⁵ but no revisional activity in the realm of Hebrew Scripture was ever consistent.⁴⁶ Joffe has reviewed the various alternative explanations for the evidence.⁴⁷ For example, some scholars emphasize that not only the predominance of *elohim* in the Elohistic Psalter needs to be explained, but also that of *YHWH* in the other segments.⁴⁸ However, there is nothing unusual in the predominance of the name *YHWH* in the Psalms or any other book of Hebrew Scripture since that was the main name of Israel's God.⁴⁹ According to Joffe, this editorial process "was unrelated to and therefore predates any hesitation to pronounce the Tetragrammaton."⁵⁰

We do not know at which stage the second and third books of the Psalter were submitted to a revision of the divine name, and we do not understand why this reviser would have limited himself to these two books. Therefore, these

42 Cf. 14:2, 4, 7 // 53:3, 5, 7 and 40:14a, 17 // 70:2a, 5. Note also the phrase אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהֵי / אֱלֹהֵיךְ in 43:4; 45:8; 50:7 as well as Psalm 82:1 "God has taken his place in the divine council; in the midst of the gods he holds judgment" (NRSV) where we would have expected *YHWH* in the first stich.

43 See, for example, R. Kittel, *Die Psalmen* (KAT; Leipzig: Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1914), xxii.

44 See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 218–221.

45 M.D. Goulder, *The Psalms of the Sons of Korah* (JSOTSup 20; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982), 5.

46 See chapter 3 in this volume.

47 Joffe, "Elohistic Psalter"; see also *eadem*, "The Answer to the Meaning of Life, the Universe and the Elohistic Psalter," *JSOT* 27 (2002): 223–235.

48 G.H. Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (SBLDS 76; Chico, Ca., 1985), 196–197: "[t]he really striking feature of these data is not so much the reduced occurrence of the name *YHWH* in the 'Elohistic Psalter' as it is the *almost complete elimination* of *elohim* as a designation for the God of Israel elsewhere."

49 Besides, the book of Psalms is a book of artistic creations, and the predominance of *YHWH* as compared with *elohim* in most Psalms needs no explanation. Joffe, "Elohistic Psalter," 165 discards these alternative explanations in detail, concluding that "[a]ll the evidence presented points toward the Elohistic Psalter being the result of a highly skilled editorial process."

50 *Ibid.*, 165–166.

changes must have been inserted at an early stage, before these two books were combined with the other three collections to form the present book of Psalms.⁵¹ I suggest that when the archetype of this book was composed, the five books of the Psalter were contained in five different scrolls, and some or all of these scrolls had undergone an Elohist revision. It is possible that only the second and third books were revised; alternatively, all five books may have been revised. In any event, by coincidence two revised and three unrevised scrolls were juxtaposed in the master copy of the Psalter. This action took place at an early date, possibly before the creation of MT, since the alternation of the different names is presupposed by all ancient sources. Among other things, the LXX rather consistently distinguished between the equivalents אלהים—θεός and יהוה—κύριος. The Qumran copies of the Psalter are based on the MT-form of the Psalter since the Elohist Psalms do not appear *seriatim* but are dispersed in the Qumran Psalters in various sequences.⁵²

The revision by the Elohist reviser involved relatively small changes; there is no evidence that this reviser made any changes beyond those relating to the divine name. That the Elohist Psalter existed at one time independently can be seen from its duplication of a Psalm also included in the first book (Psalms 14 // 53).

4.3 *The Special Position of Jeremiah 27–29*

Chapters 27–29 of Jeremiah in MT differ rather consistently from the remainder of Jeremiah in three groups of small details:

1. The name of the king of Babylon is spelled in the MT of chapters 27–29 in its later form, *Nebuchadnezzar* (except for 29:21 *Nebuchadrezzar*),⁵³ while in the remainder of the book it occurs in its original form, *Nebuchadrezzar*.⁵⁴ Since the name of the king is lacking in all its occurrences in these chapters in the LXX (as well as often elsewhere in the Greek version), these added

⁵¹ Thus also A. Weiser, *The Psalms: A Commentary* (London: SCM Press, 1962), 99: “If the whole Psalter had been assembled when this Elohist revision was carried out, it would be incomprehensible why that action was confined to this group of Psalms.” A similar idea was suggested by J. Ben-Dov in *Shnaton* 17 (2007): 344 in a review of F.L. Hossfeld, *Psalms* 2 (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 2005).

⁵² For details, see the list in Flint, *Psalms*, 257–264. On the other hand, in MasPsa, the Psalms of the Elohist Psalter appear in the MT sequence.

⁵³ Eight times. Elsewhere, this form occurs in 2 Kings (6×), Esther (1×), Daniel (21×), Ezra–Nehemiah (6×), Chronicles (5×).

⁵⁴ Twenty-nine times. This form also occurs in Ezekiel (4×).

names in MT of chapters 27–29 may be recognized as a linguistically later layer.⁵⁵

2. Most theophoric names in Jeremiah are of the long type, for example, *Yirmeyahu* (241× altogether). The shorter theophoric names ending with *-yah* form a minority in the book (73×).⁵⁶ On the other hand, in chapters 27–29 the short forms prevail with 32 instances⁵⁷ as opposed to 8 long forms.⁵⁸ These shortened forms are a sign of Late Hebrew, and accordingly their frequency rises in Chronicles and in the Qumran scrolls.⁵⁹ The present MT form of these chapters thus is later than that of the other chapters.⁶⁰
3. While in the book as a whole the short title “Jeremiah” prevails,⁶¹ in chapters 27–29 the long formula “Jeremiah the prophet” appears eight times in MT as opposed to 3 occurrences of the short formula.⁶² With its short formulas in chapters 27–29,⁶³ the LXX holds a middle course, but is less close to the practice of MT in these chapters than in the rest of the book. Elsewhere, the

55 For an analysis of other secondary elements of the MT layer not represented in the LXX, see my studies “Exegetical Notes on the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX of Jeremiah 27 (34),” in *Greek–Hebrew Bible*, 315–331; “The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Its Textual History,” *ibid.*, 363–384; “The Characterization of the Additional Layer of the Masoretic Text of Jeremiah,” *Erlsr* 26 (Frank Moore Cross Volume; ed. B.A. Levine et al.; Heb. with Eng. summ.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion, 1999), 55–63. See also H.-J. Stipp, *Das Masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches, Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte* (OBO 136; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994); *idem*, *Jeremiabuch, Begleitmaterialien: Einleitung, Der Prämasoretische Idiolekt im Jeremiabuch* (9th edition; Munich, Ludwig-Maximilians Universität, 2013).

56 Gedalyah 4×, Gemariah 1×, Habaziniyah 1×, Hananyah 10×, Hilkiah 1×, Hoshaiyah 2×, Jaazaniyah 1×, Jeconiah 3×, Irijah 2×, Kolaiah 1×, Maaseiah 4×, Neriah 7×, Nethaniah 12×, Zephaniah 4×, Seraiah 5×, Shelemiah 2×, Shemaiah 3×, Shephatiah 1×, Yirmeyah 9×. These figures include chapters 27–29.

57 Zedekiah 27:12, 28:1, 29:3; Jeconiah 27:20, 28:4, 29:2; Yirmeyah 28:5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 12, 29:1; Hananiah 28:1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17; Gemariah 29:3; Hilkiah 29:3; Kolaiah 29:21; Ma’aseiah 29:21, 25; Shema’iah 29:31, 31, 32; Zephaniah 29:29.

58 Yoshiyahu 27:1; Zidkiyahu 27:3, 29:21, 22; Shema’yahu 29:24; Yirmeyahu 29:27, 29, 30.

59 See Kutscher, *Language*, 4–5.

60 As far as we can tell, the transcriptions in the LXX do not distinguish between the long and short forms (Yirmeyah/ Yirmeyahu, Hananiah/ Hananyahu).

61 Ninety-one times as opposed to 23 occurrences of the long formula “Jeremiah the prophet.”

62 28:12; 29:27, 30.

63 28:5, 6, 10, 11, 15; 29:1, 29. In 28:12, the LXX reflects a different formulation.

LXX often lacks the long formula⁶⁴ or has the short formula.⁶⁵ Similarly, in these chapters, the long phrase “Hananiah the prophet” prevails in MT as opposed to the short phrase in the LXX.⁶⁶

Chapters 27–29 in MT thus differ from the remainder of the book in small details that were presumably changed or added at a late stage in the development of the book. These chapters deal with the same interconnected themes: Jeremiah’s polemic against the false prophets and the idea that Babylon cannot be overthrown. The assumption that these three chapters were once contained in a small scroll is therefore inescapable.⁶⁷ By implication, the complete book of Jeremiah was originally contained in several small scrolls.⁶⁸ Only at the very last stage were the contents of these small scrolls transferred to one or two large scrolls, and at that stage the little scroll containing chapters 27–29 coincidentally reflected a reality of the book different from that of the other chapters. This process must have happened at a relatively late stage in the development of the book since these chapters contain different literary sources (chapter 27 is a Dtr reworking of the prophet’s own words [sources A + C], while chapters 28 and 29 contain the biographer’s account [source B]).⁶⁹ We somehow have to combine the assumption of the two editions (editions I and II) of Jeremiah, and that of the special character of chapters 27–29 in MT.⁷⁰ It seems to us that the editor of MT (edition II) took for chapters 27–29 a little scroll that coincidentally differed from the scrolls of the other chapters of Jeremiah. Alternatively, that little scroll underwent a different fate in the course of the transmission.

64 20:2; 25:2; 38:9; 46:1; 47:1; 49:34; 50:1.

65 32:2, 34:6, 36:8, 26; 37:2, 3, 6, 13; 42:4; 46:13. Only in 42:2; 43:6; 45:1; 51:59 both texts have the long formula. For comparative tables, see J.G. Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah* (HSM 6; Cambridge, MA: 1973), 145–148.

66 28:5, 10, 12, 15, 17. The full phrase “Hananiah son of Azur the prophet” occurs in both texts at the beginning of the story (28:1).

67 The separate circulation of these three chapters has also been posited by other scholars. See N. Sarna, “The Abortive Insurrection in Zedekiah’s Day (Jer. 27–29),” in *ErIsr* 14 (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1978), 89*–96* (92*–93*) with earlier literature; B. Sommer, “New Light on the Composition of Jeremiah,” *CBQ* 61 (1999): 646–666.

68 This is not an unusual assumption in view of the writing of part of the book in a single scroll according to chapter 36.

69 See W. Rudolph, *Jeremia* (HAT; 2nd edition; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1958), 158.

70 See the studies mentioned in n. 55.

5 Summary

We set out to test our working hypothesis according to which the collections of authoritative Scripture, in Hebrew and translation, are textually heterogeneous because their contents were often not planned in the modern sense of the word. The major reason for this diversity is connected to the fact that the collections were composed from single scrolls of a different nature and background. We attempted to base this assumption on various examples relating to the LXX, Peshitta, and MT. Also the Qumran corpus is heterogeneous, but that collection did not contain a sealed corpus of authoritative writings so that its heterogeneity is not reflected in any one final group of writings. Lack of planning should be expected in antiquity, but since several collections of ancient Scripture became the basis for Judaism and Christianity, we have to delve into their prehistory. MT has become the basis for Judaism. It is a good text, but we cannot close our eyes to the fact that at an earlier time the collection now named MT was composed from scrolls of a different nature.⁷¹ The LXX translation has become hallowed Scripture within Christianity, but we should realize that the collection of ancient Jewish Greek Scripture formed a very diverse and unplanned collection. From a *textual* point of view one could even say that the fact that this specific group of Greek translations, and not another, has become Christian Scripture is coincidental. For example, had the Greek translators used or created a different form of Daniel and Esther, without the so-called Additions, the Christian canon would have been different. Coincidence was an important factor in the compilation of the archetypes of the collections, and this factor has to be taken seriously into consideration. Textual transmission is likewise plagued by coincidence, as are all archeological excavations.⁷²

71 For a similar thought, see B. Albrektson, *Text, Translation, Theology: Selected Essays on the Hebrew Bible* (SOTSMS; Farnham/Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010 [1978], 60): "... the crystallization of a standard consonantal text is not primarily the outcome of conscious and deliberate measures taken by the rabbis but, to a much greater extent than is usually thought, the result of historical coincidences, of a number of concurrent factors which are not in the main of a textual kind." For a different type of thinking, see: F.M. Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert," in Cross-Talmon, *QHBT*, 186: "In the case of Samuel, it is difficult to understand the selection of the Proto-Massoretic tradition in view of the excellence of the Old Palestinian text-type, available at least at Qumran." The assumption of the deliberate choice of a text is opposed to the idea of coincidence suggested here.

72 See A. Millard, "Only Fragments from the Past: The Role of Accident in Our Knowledge of the Ancient Near East," in *Writing and Ancient Near Eastern Society: Papers in Honour of Alan R. Millard* (ed. P. Bienkowski et al.; New York/London: T & T Clark, 2005), 301–319.

Some Reflections on Consistency in the Activity of Scribes and Translators

1 Background

The British writer Aldous Huxley (1894–1963) once said, “Consistency is contrary to nature, contrary to life. The only completely consistent people are the dead.” The topic of my paper is a study of this consistency. We all know that there is no consistency, but nevertheless in our analysis of the ancients we often act as if they embraced that ideal. When analyzing an author, scribe or translator we can easily find ourselves saying, “here the scribe wrote x, *but* in chapter 6 he wrote y.” Or, “here the scribe inserted a new section, *but* in a similar situation he did not do so.” Or, “here a translator used this equivalent, *but* in chapter 7 he rendered differently.” Our analysis refers to the implications of the word “but.”

In this paper, we want to offer some reflections on consistency in the world of ancient biblical scribes and translators. I suggest that consistency was not part of their world. These persons sometimes display *tendencies* towards consistency, but no more than that. The absence of consistency did not disturb the ancients, since the aspiration for consistency is an invention of later centuries. Consistency is probably a product of schools, universities, and other frameworks that did not exist in the world of the ancient biblical scribes and translators and to the extent that such frameworks did exist, the ancients did not try to adhere to them.

This paper examines approaches of ancient scribes and translators. When we talk of scribes, we refer to the two functions of these tradents, authorship combined with copying at a stage when the content of compositions could still be altered, and the technical copying when such changes could no longer be inserted. In this brief paper, we limit ourselves to some philosophical deliberations.

Consistency pertains to situations in which, under normal circumstances, the same procedures, approaches, and actions are expected. If different opinions or differences in taste created variation, such differences are not taken into consideration. We claim that consistency can be studied only in some areas of activity. As with the phenomenon described, this paper is neither exhaustive nor consistent.

2 Hebrew Scribes: Spelling

When turning to the area of spelling in Hebrew compositions, it would be natural to first turn to MT, but MT is not a manuscript written by a single scribe. It is the end product of a long scribal tradition. We can no longer locate the individual scribes behind this procedure. Probably none of them adhered to a clear system, and MT thus reflects a patchwork of different scribal practices.

MT is a precise text, and from a certain period onwards its underlying text was copied very carefully. Within the framework of its precision, we would expect MT to be consistent in its orthography but it is not so, neither within individual Scripture books nor between the books. Consistency and precision thus are disparate features. Paradoxically, each generation of Masoretic scribes precisely copied the inconsistent spelling of earlier generations. A case in point is the spelling of *me'orot* (luminaries) in the first chapter of Genesis. The spelling of this word provides four possibilities, which we will examine in MT, SP, and two Qumran scrolls.

- Full-defective with the *waw* in the first syllable: מאורת (as in מאור)
- Full-full with the *waw* in both syllables: מאורות
- Defective-full: מארות
- Defective-defective: מארת

Reference	MT	4QGen ^b	4QGen ^g	4QGen ^k	SP
Gen 1:14	מארת	מא[רת]	מארות	מארות	מאורות
Gen 1:15	למאורת	למארת		[ל]מארות	למאורות
Gen 1:16	המארת	המארת	המארות		המאורות

We note the following:

1. MT is internally inconsistent, with two defective (vv. 14, 16) and one full-defective (v. 15) spelling.¹

¹ Cf. also מאורי (Ezek 32:8). The noun in the singular is always מאור: Gen 1:6, 16; Exod 27:20; 35:8, 14, 28; 39:37; Lev 24:2; Num 4:9, 16; Ps 74:16; 90:8; Prov 15:30; the only exception in MT is המאר (Exod 25:6 (SP המאור)).

2. SP is internally consistent with the completely full spelling מאורות in vv. 14, 15, 16.
3. 4QGen^b is internally consistent with the defective spelling in all three verses (מארת).
4. 4QGen^{g,k} are internally consistent with the defective-full spelling (מארות).

In the nonbiblical Qumran scrolls, the word is almost always full-full with the feminine and masculine endings (מאורות, מאורים).

No conclusions may be drawn on the basis of this one word, but it is clear that the spelling of this word in Genesis 1 in MT is not consistent.

By the same token, other combinations of *matres lectionis*² in one word yield different spellings patterns in MT:³

הקמתי, הקמותי, הקימתי, (ו)הקימותי

The plural form of נביא also appears in MT with three different spellings:

נביאים (3×), נְבִיאִים (32×), נְבִיאִים (64×)

The same applies to the plural form of מקום:

מקומות (3×), מְקוֹמֹת (11×), מְקוֹמוֹת (2×)

However, the issue is more complex. The end product, MT, may be described now as inconsistent, but within its own framework it should not be considered as such because there were virtually no spelling norms in the last centuries BCE. A scribe should not be considered inconsistent vis-à-vis non-existent norms.⁴

Orthography in general may therefore not be the best area for examining consistency. This feature can be examined only if *intentional action* is involved. If a scribe acts according to certain internal or external directions, we can examine how he carried out his plans, for example, as in the layout of the Psalms, the separation of Psalms with a blank line, the layout of Psalm superscriptions, the

2 See the discussion in Elias Levita, *Massoreth Ha-Massoreth*, p. 166 in Ginsburg's edition, 1867 (repr. New York: Ktav, 1968); F.I. Andersen and D. Forbes, *Spelling in the Hebrew Bible* (BO 41; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986), 27.

3 See further *TCHB*, 208–218.

4 Viewed from a different angle, MT is an intermediate stage between the very defective orthography as in the Siloam inscription and the full system such as in the Isaiah scroll.

writing of the divine names in paleo-Hebrew characters, and the production of neat writing blocks with clearly indicated left-hand borderlines.

We can no longer investigate the orthography of the original scribes, since we do not have their texts. In a way, autographs alone may be examined for consistency, since subsequent scribes and readers changed the earlier text and did not create their own systems. For example, 1QIsa^a's system of orthography is far from consistent, but at least the tetragrammaton was always written in the square Hebrew script. However, a second scribe who inserted between the lines of col. xxxiii the text of Isaiah 40:7–8, which had been overlooked by the original scribe, indicated the tetragrammaton with four dots (a custom known also from other places). This is the only place in 1QIsa^a where the tetragrammaton is written in this way, and this goes to show that generations of additional scribes sometimes created disharmony.

Most aspects of scribal activity cannot be examined for consistency because we cannot unravel the layers of scribal activity. The best opportunity for examining consistency in orthography or any other area is when a one-time effort may be recognized to insert certain changes, in other words, when *intentional action* is recognized. In my view, the Qumran scribal practice reflects such intentions when the earlier system of orthography and morphology was changed to a new one.

In the new system, כִּי became בִּי, הוּא became הוּאָה, אַתָּם became אַתְּמָה, etc. Because of these frequent replacements, we can examine the consistency of the changes. We can sometimes still ascertain when the changes were inserted, since scribes sometimes inserted them secondarily after having forgotten to insert the changes in the first place. A remarkably large number of changes pertain to the long pronominal suffixes that are characteristic of the Qumran scribal practice, such as 4QDeut^j x 2 (Exod 12:48) אַתְּכֶסֶה and 4QTest (4Q175) 5 אַחִיהֶסֶה, אַחִיהֶסֶה.⁵ In particular, scribe B of 1QIsa^a employed such forms.⁶ In all these cases, it appears as if the scribe at first wrote the standard short pronominal suffix, possibly as extant in his *Vorlage*, but subsequently remembered that he should have written the long form. See chapter 26 in the present volume. Two different conditions may be distinguished:

5 See the full data in *Scribal Practices*, chapter 5, Table 20.

6 See J.P. Siegel, *The Scribes of Qumran: Studies in the Early History of Jewish Scribal Customs, with Special Reference to the Qumran Biblical Scrolls and to the Tannaitic Traditions of Massekhet Soferim*, unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Brandeis University, 1971 (University Microfilms, 1972), Appendix III (242–244).

The scribe recognized his mistake while writing. E.g. 1QH^a 11 22 וּבְבִרְיָדָה: Upon writing וּבְבִרְיָדָה, the scribe realized that he should have written the long form, with a *he*, which he then added before continuing the writing. A *space* is left between this and the following word. Most instances are of this type.

The scribe recognized his mistake upon completing the writing. Less frequently, when the scribe recognized the mistake only later, the correction was inserted in the *space* between the words. Thus, in some cases, the additional letter was added above the line in the space, as in 11QT^a (11Q19) LVI 13 אֲשִׁים^ה, and 4QD^a (4Q266) 11 13 מְרַעֲיָדָה^ה, or was written in smaller characters than the surrounding letters as in 4QapocrJosh^a (4Q378) 3 i 8 עֲלִידָה.

Based on the assumption that one system was changed to another one, we can now examine the statistical relation between the old and new system, which can also be expressed as inconsistency (see the Tables in Tov, *Scribal Practices*, Appendix cols. 5, 6, 18). For example,

	Suffix 2nd and 3rd person plural in nouns	Suffix 2nd and 3rd person plural in prepositions	Suffix כה/ן in nouns, prepositions, and verbs
1QIsa ^a scribe A	79/7 (92/8 %)	26/14 (65/35 %)	97/17 (85/15 %)
1QIsa ^a scribe B	53/111 (32/68 %)	8/49 (14/86 %)	18/210 (8/92 %)
4QIsa ^c			50/50 %
1QH ^a scribe A			0/105 (0/100 %)
4QPhyl G–I (4Q137)			80/20 %

The figures, reflecting a large number of instances, clearly show that within each unit different orthographical tendencies were in vogue.⁷

⁷ All other cases are clearer regarding the preferences; after all, the distinction between the scribal schools is based on them.

3 Hebrew Scribes: Revisions

An area in which consistency can be judged easily is in the creation of the so-called Elohistic Psalter. See chapter 2 in this volume.

4 Scribes: Revisions, SP and Proto-Samaritan Texts

The proto-Samaritan texts and the Samaritan Pentateuch changed many details in the earlier texts, but did not do so in all possible instances. The partial nature of this revision should not be stressed too greatly since one instance may have been considered worthy of change, and another one not. Nevertheless, in the following instances no such judgment is involved.

- a. The paragodic nun of *yiqṭ^lun* was removed ten times by SP or its source, for example, in Exod 4:9, MT ישמעון, SP ישמעו.⁸ On the other hand, this form was left 76 times in SP, under the same circumstances, for example in Gen 3:3, 4. The short form was preferred to the long one in the late biblical books and in most biblical Qumran scrolls.⁹
- b. A high percentage of perfect *pu'al* forms of MT were changed in SP in different ways:

Reference	MT	SP
Gen 25:10	קבר	קבור
Gen 40:15	גנב וגנבתי	גנוב וגנבתי
Gen 45:19	צויתה	צויתי
Exod 12:39	גרשו ממצרים	גרשום מצרים
Exod 22:6	גנב	וגנב = 4QpaleoExod ^m
Exod 28:7	וחבר	יחבר
Lev 10:16	שרף	שרוף
Num 3:16	צוה	צוהו

8 See further Exod 15:14, 22:21, 30; Deut 6:14, 8:3, 12:4, 13:5, 12, 17:13. E.J.C. Tigchelaar (personal communication) points to the inconsistent removal of such *nuns* in 4QExod^c in Exod 9:29, 30; 15:14; 17:2.

9 For the data, see T. Muraoka, "An Approach to the Morphosyntax and Syntax of Qumran Hebrew," in *Diggers at the Well*, 193–214 (198–199).

However, in other instances, the earlier forms were left untouched.¹⁰ The changes in the *pu'al* form in SP are not made for the passive *qal* forms such as לקח (Gen 3:23).¹¹ These changes may have been made in the *pu'al* forms because there is no equivalent verbal form in Aramaic.¹²

- c. The usual form for “generating” children in the Bible is ילד in the *qal* for women and in the *hiph'il* for men (הוליד, e.g. Gen 5:3). When MT uses ילד in the *qal* for men, SP corrects twice to the *hiph'il*: Gen 10:8; 22:23. However, most cases were not revised when the SP used ילד in the *qal* for men.¹³
- d. Apocopated future forms of verbs *primae yod* were usually replaced by regular ones in SP, e.g. Gen 5:3 MT ויולד was replaced with ויוליד in SP, as well as always elsewhere.¹⁴ Likewise ותוצא (MT = 4QGen^b) and ויוצא were replaced with ותוריד and ויוריד in SP Gen 1:2, 48:12; ותורד was replaced with ותוריד in SP Gen 24:26; ויוכח was replaced with ויהוכיח in SP Gen 31:42; ויושע was replaced with ויורישע in SP Exod 14:30, and ויורש was replaced with ויורישו in SP Num 32:39. At the same time, ותוצא and ויוצא(ו) were not changed in Gen 15:5; 24:53; Exod 19:17; Num 17:23,24; Deut 4:20.

5 Scribes: Revisional Tendencies in the MT of Samuel

At one stage, the theophoric element *Ba'al* must have been common in proper names, as is still visible in various layers of the biblical text. At a later stage, such theophoric elements were undesirable, and they were either removed or replaced with other elements such as the derogatory element בִּשְׁת “shame.” This phenomenon is especially evident in the comparison of Samuel and its parallel text in Chronicles. Even though Chronicles was composed after Samuel, in this particular case its manuscripts often preserve earlier textual traditions. Therefore, this phenomenon pertains to the scribes rather than to the authors of the biblical books. Corrected names appear only in the MT of Samuel, as shown in the third and fourth columns of the Table in *TCHB*, 248, where this phenomenon is dealt with in detail.

10 Gen 44:3; Exod 9:31, 32; 15:4; 22:15; 29:33; 38:21; 39:4; Lev 6:21; 10:13; 13:58; 15:17; 19:20; Num 15:34; 36:2; Deut 22:28; 33:3.

11 On the other hand, Gen 31:39 MT (2×) גִּבְתִּי was corrected in SP to גִּבְתָּהּ.

12 In the case of the *hoph'al*, for which there is no equivalent either in Aramaic, SP did not alter the forms.

13 Gen 4:8; 10:13, 15, 24, 26; 25:3.

14 18 times in chapter 5; 6:11; 15 times in chapter 11; 44:20.

6 Translators

The evaluation of translators is more difficult than that of scribes, because the act of translating requires subjective reasoning. As in the case of scribes, it is often difficult to evaluate individual translators, since they did not work in a vacuum. Translators often followed the practices of earlier translators, and therefore what looks like inconsistency may have been influenced by these earlier sources. Some of the equivalents in the books of the LXX may also reflect occasional revisional activity by known or unknown revisers, and therefore, once again, an evaluation of the evidence is complicated.

These complications may imply that we cannot express an opinion regarding the consistency of translators, but nevertheless there seem to be some basic facts that should help us in evaluating the evidence. The study of consistency in translation equivalents is very much a matter of definition. Some translators consistently rendered a given Hebrew lexeme in the same way, for example, the consistent rendering of שׂאִי with ἀνὴρ also when שׂאִי is used as “whoever.” Translators who consistently followed such a type of rendering are very rare. Other translators, attentive to context, would use instead a rendering such as ἑκάστος. The difference between these two types of translators is not that one was consistent and the other was not, but that one was attentive to context and the other was not.

In other words, one type of translator was often consistently attentive to context, while the other one consistently adhered to the same equivalents. The latter type of translator is often called literal or stereotyped, but complete consistency is rare in the LXX, and is only evidenced in the so-called revisions of the LXX, foremost in *kaige*-Th and Aquila.¹⁵ Complete consistency was impossible because the lack of such modern tools as concordances and search programs did not enable the revisers to reach all occurrences of a given root. It is actually amazing how much they were able to achieve without these tools.

It seems to me that *kaige*-Th was more consistent than the Targum Onqelos, since Onqelos was more attentive to context. However, I have no comparative figures.

In a study of a limited semantic field, Bernstein showed that Onqelos had 1:1 equivalents in the area of oaths and vows, but that he deviated from them under certain circumstances. Thus, Onqelos distinguished between regular swear-

¹⁵ Because of the complicated textual transmission of the manuscripts, their level of consistency cannot always be measured, but it looks like they obtained a high level of consistency in lexical equivalence, which created many a Hebraistic rendering.

ing (קיים) and false swearing (אשתבע),¹⁶ just like some of the LXX translators distinguished between a regular prophet (προφήτης) and a false prophet (ψευδοπροφήτης).¹⁷ On a much wider scale, Posen showed the same principle in the analysis of many words in Onkelos, who deviated from his standard equivalents for linguistic, Halakhic and Midrashic reasons.¹⁸

Summary

In the investigation of consistency in the work of scribes and translators, the present paper offered some philosophical thoughts. We provided data in select areas only, suggesting that the ancients did not strive for consistency. We suggest that we should not state that a translator rendered in this way in chapter 6, but in that way in chapter 7, or that a scribe spelled in this way in chapter 6 and differently in chapter 7. In many cases, consistency cannot be easily evaluated, but when we can express an opinion, especially in the case of revisional activity, we witness only an endeavor towards consistency.

-
- 16 M.J. Bernstein, "Oaths and Vows in the Pentateuchal Targumim: Semantics and Exegesis," *Sha'arei Lashon, Studies in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Jewish Languages Presented to Moshe Bar-Asher* (Heb.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2007), 2:20*–41*.
- 17 The Greek translator (in my view, reviser) of the second part of the LXX of Jeremiah employed this word, which was probably coined within the realm of the LXX, inconsistently (8 ×), while leaving προφήτης three times for "false prophets." For details, see Tov, *Jeremiah–Baruch*, 71.
- 18 R.B. Posen, *The Consistency of Targum Onkelos' Translation* (Heb.; Jerusalem: Magnes, 2004).

From 4QReworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch (?)

1 Background

The name “4QReworked Pentateuch” was conceived in 1992 when I was working on this composition at the Annenberg Institute for Advanced Studies, at first alone, and later together with Sidnie White Crawford.¹ The texts were assigned to me in the 1980s by J. Strugnell, who had identified the manuscripts and had done some work on them. Beyond Strugnell’s initial philological work on these texts, we are indebted to him for assembling the fragments that he assigned to the four manuscripts of this nonbiblical composition (4Q364–367) from among the many thousands, identified by their handwriting and content. This was not an easy task because of the great similarity of the assumed text of this nonbiblical composition to the canonical books of the Torah. As a result, doubts remained as to whether fragments assigned to 4QRP indeed belonged to that composition, or were part of a regular biblical manuscript. In addition, the following six fragments or groups of fragments, although given different names, could have been part of 4QRP: 2QExod^b (containing several exegetical additions), 4QExod^d (omitting the narrative section of 13:17–22 and all of chapter 14), 6QDeut? (possibly to be named 6QparaDeut because of its unclear character), 4QDeut^{k2} (containing a mixture of chapters) and 11QT^b XI 21–24 (previously described as 11QDeut [Deut 13:7–11] by van der Ploeg, but identified as part of 11QT^b by A.S. van der Woude and F. García Martínez).²

At that early stage, when Strugnell was still collecting the fragments, he named this composition “4QPentateuchal Paraphrase.” Its genre was considered as related to 4Q158, published in *DJD* V (1968) by Allegro as “4QBiblical Paraphrase.”³

The analysis of the so-called “4QPentateuchal Paraphrase” was determined by that of 4Q158 even though a genetic connection between the two had not been recognized. 4Q158 was published by Allegro in his characteristic nonchalant system in *DJD* V.⁴

1 The texts were published as: E. Tov and S. White, “4QReworked Pentateuch^{b-e} and 4QTemple?” in *DJD* XIII, 187–351, 459–463 and plates XIII–XXXVI.

2 For details, see my study “4QReworked Pentateuch: A Synopsis of Its Contents,” in *HB, GK, and Qumran*, 21–26.

3 J.M. Allegro, “158. Biblical Paraphrase. Genesis, Exodus,” in *DJD* V.

4 The number of textual notes was absolutely minimal, and there was no introduction explain-

It is important to remember the history of the analysis of these texts and the genre names given to them. Since 4Q158 had been published as “4QBiblical Paraphrase,” Strugnell used the same name for 4Q364–367, which he presumed to belong to the same genre. Its first name therefore was “4QPentateuchal Paraphrase” (4QPP), a name we inherited from J. Strugnell. However, we realized that the term “paraphrase” was not appropriate for 4QPP, since a paraphrase usually involves a more extensive type of editing than that presumably performed by the author of this composition. After all, the manuscripts included long stretches of text unaltered by the author of 4QPP. Looking for a more general term that reflected the nature of these manuscripts, we opted for 4QRe-worked Pentateuch. The thought behind this change was that “reworking” is more general than “paraphrase” and would allow for long stretches of unaltered text. The first identity crisis of 4Q364–367 thus was its name change from 4QPP to 4QRP. In our conception, 4QRP included 4Q158, which I had identified as belonging to the same composition as 4Q364–367.⁵

The second identity crisis was to come much later. In the meantime, when naming the composition 4QPP or renaming it as 4QRP, we were much influenced by Strugnell. At the same time, I had a strong internal conviction that 4QRP could not represent a biblical text. Nevertheless, I did not know exactly what was the genre of this composition, described as a reworked Bible composition⁶ similar to 11QT^a LI–LXVI. In my introduction to 4QRP, I described its character as follows:

The five manuscripts of 4QRP share important characteristics. These five groups of fragments should therefore be seen as copies of the same composition, rather than, in more general terms, of the same literary genre. This composition contained a running text of the Pentateuch interspersed with exegetical additions

ing the literary genre of 4Q158, although it was novel at the time of its publication. Further, the transcription included many wrong details; the line numbering is incorrect in fragments 10–12, and the close connection between 4Q158 and the SP was not recognized. In due course, J. Strugnell corrected many of Allegro's mistakes in his book-length review, “Notes en marge du Volume V des ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,’” *RevQ* 7 (1970): 163–276 (168–175).

5 See my analysis in *DJD* XIII, 189–191.

6 For studies on this literary genre, see G.J. Brooke, “Rewritten Bible,” in *Encyclopedia of the DSS*, 2:777–781; idem, “The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible,” in *The Bible as Book*, 31–40; D.D. Swanson, “How Scriptural is Re-Written Bible?” *RevQ* 21 (2004) 407–427; M. Segal, “Between Bible and Rewritten Bible,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2005) 10–29; M.J. Bernstein, “‘Rewritten Bible’: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?,” *Textus* 22 (2005): 169–196. See

and omissions. The greater part of the preserved fragments follows the biblical text closely, but many small exegetical elements are added, while other elements are omitted, or, in other cases, their sequence altered. The exegetical character of this composition is especially evident from several exegetical additions comprising half a line, one line, two lines, and even seven or eight lines. The most outstanding examples of this technique are the expanded Song of Miriam in 4Q365 6a ii and c and possibly also frg. 14 of 4Q158.⁷

A third fragment, namely 4QRP^c (4Q365) 23, deviates in a major way from the other biblical texts. The first four lines of this fragment quote the last two verses of the instructions for the *Sukkot* festival in Lev 23:42–43, as well as a summarizing verse (23:44), and Lev 24:1–2. However, in frg. 23 the beginning of Leviticus 24 now serves as the introduction to a list of additional laws concerning offerings. These laws are based on material found either in the Bible or elsewhere, such as the Festival of Fresh Oil (frg. 23 9). Lines 10 and 11 probably refer to the Wood Festival, also known from Neh 10:35, 13:31 and 11QT^a.⁸

4QRP is also characterized by several deviations from the text sequence of MT and all other texts.⁹ Thus, the *Sukkot* laws of Num 29:32–30:1 and Deut 16:13–14 were combined in 4QRP^b (4Q364) 23a–b i. In this case, one does not know where this fragment was placed in 4QRP, in Numbers or Deuteronomy.

The extensive additions in the Song of Miriam in 4QRP^c (4Q365) 6a ii and c, in the additional laws concerning offerings (ibid., frg. 23), and in frg. 14 of 4QRP^a (4Q158) differed so much from the biblical manuscripts I knew that I could not imagine that 4QRP contained a biblical manuscript. Obviously, determining the

also E. Tov, "Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QParaGen–Exod," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant, The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 10; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 111–134; D.J. Harrington, S.J., "Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Prophecies," in *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpretations* (ed. R.A. Kraft and G.W. Nickelsburg; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 242–247.

7 Tov–White, *DJD* XIII, 191. Frg. 14 of 4Q158 provides an unknown exegetical addition or commentary mentioning "Egypt," "I shall redeem them," "the midst of the sea in the depths." This fragment, written in the same hand as the remainder of 4Q158, reflects a rather long addition, relating to the story of Exodus.

8 For both festivals, see *DJD* XIII, 295.

9 In *DJD* XIII, 191, I noted: "The sequence of the individual elements of 4QRP cannot be reconstructed. In one instance, a fragment juxtaposing a section from Numbers and Deuteronomy (4Q364 23a–b i: Num 20:17–18; Deut 2:8–14) probably derives from the rewritten text of Deuteronomy, since a similar sequence is found in SP."

relation between the new text 4QRP and the scriptural manuscripts depends on one's definition of a Scripture text. The more extensive one's definition of the biblical texts, for example when including the Qumran Psalter texts and excerpted texts, the greater the chances that one would be inclined to include 4QRP among the biblical texts. However, my own definition of the biblical texts was not so encompassing as to include these texts. As a result, we did not consider 4QRP a biblical text. The extended Song of Miriam adds an exegetical dimension to the text that was not equaled in any biblical text I could think of. The seven lines of added text recreated the Song of Miriam that in the canonical text consists of only one verse. The new creation is based on that verse and on the wording of the Song of Moses. The list of biblical and extra-biblical festivals in 4QRP^c (4Q365) 23 involves a similar exegetical dimension. True, such exegetical additions are found also in the Targumim, but they are not biblical manuscripts.

I did not recognize any parallel to this expanded Song in the LXX of other books because, in my view at the time, most major LXX deviations from MT reflect elements *anterior* to MT, such as the LXX texts of Samuel, Jeremiah, Ezekiel; hence, they did not parallel the Song of Miriam, since that Song is clearly secondary. I say this as a justification for my view, since in my textual outlook of the 1990s there was no room for major post-MT exegetical expansions among the authoritative Scripture texts in the LXX. I also did not consider the many SP additions to be valid parallels to the Song of Miriam since the SP does not add any *new* material compared with its putative textual base. It only repeats sections in an immediate or remote context.¹⁰ By the same token, I did not know of any authoritative Hebrew biblical manuscript from Qumran or elsewhere that included such large exegetical additions. This statement is subjective, since the Psalms scrolls, especially 11QPs^a, would have provided a parallel to a biblical scroll 4QRP, but I do not consider these Psalms scrolls to be Scripture texts. The modern names of these scrolls are misleading, since in my view these are liturgical scrolls that alter authoritative Scripture texts.¹¹ Like 4QRP, the Psalms scrolls reflect major sequence deviations from MT. They also

10 See my *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 57–70. For an exception, see Exod 23:19b on which see *TCHB*, 80, n. 130.

11 This view is based on S. Talmon, "Pisqah Be'emša' Pasuq and 11QPs^a," *Textus* 5 (1966): 11–21; M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Psalms Scroll (11QPs^a): A Problem of Canon and Text," *Textus* 5 (1966): 22–33; M. Haran, "11QPs^a and the Canonical Book of Psalms," in *Minhah le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday* (ed. M. Brettler and M. Fishbane; JSOTSup 154; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 193–201. A different view is presented by Flint, *Psalms*.

contain a major exegetical addition, if we characterize the list of David's compositions in 11QPs^a XXVII in such a way, but otherwise they are not comparable to 4QRP. At the time, we did not compare 4QRP with the greatly deviating Canticles scrolls 4QCant^{a,b} since they had not yet been published. But even had we known them, we would not have considered them valid parallels for 4QRP as Scripture texts, since we consider these Canticles scrolls to be abbreviated texts, and hence not regular Scripture texts.¹²

This brief apologetic explanation should explain why in the 1990s I did not consider 4QRP a Bible text, the main reason being that in my textual *Weltanschauung* there was no room for Scripture texts that contained such major deviations from MT as those in 4QRP.

4Q364–367 thus entered the world as a nonbiblical text and although the majority of its components were Scriptural, it was not included in lists of biblical manuscripts such as my list in the introduction volume to *DJD*.¹³ Paradoxically, that list of Scripture manuscripts numbering 200–201 items thus included many texts we did *not* consider Scripture but which carried biblical names (most of the thirty-six Psalms scrolls, 4QCant^{a,b} and several additional texts), while it excluded 4QRP (4Q158, 4Q364–367), since they were published as non-biblical scrolls. Anthologies of Qumran texts behaved in various ways. The *Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*¹⁴ and its electronic revision in *DSSEL*,¹⁵ both recording non-biblical texts, contain the complete text of 4QRP. The Qumran concordance likewise covered all these texts.¹⁶ On the other hand, the *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*¹⁷ and the translation of Wise–Abegg–Cook¹⁸ include a mere selection

12 For a different view, see E. Ulrich, "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls: The Scriptures of Late Second Temple Judaism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (ed. T.H. Lim et al.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 67–87 (78).

13 E. Tov in *DJD* XXXIX, 165–183.

14 D.W. Parry and E. Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2004–2005; 2nd edition: 2014).

15 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library*, Brigham Young University, Revised Edition 2006, part of the Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library of E.J. Brill Publishers (ed. E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2006).

16 M.G. Abegg, Jr., with J.E. Bowley and E.M. Cook, in consultation with E. Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance 1. The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

17 F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 1997–1998).

18 M.O. Wise, M.G. Abegg, and E.M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls, A New Translation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005). This edition contains 4Q158 (inappropriately named "A Reworking of Genesis and Exodus") as well as a few selections from 4Q364–367 named "An Annotated Law of Moses."

of the exegetical additions to the MT texts. The only culprit of this inconsistency is the *DJD* edition of Tov–White.

The main focus of our present study is the second identity crisis of 4QRP. Six years after its publication, 4QRP was described as a biblical text by two scholars, who were not influenced by Strugnell as we were, and who also knew more parallel texts than we did in 1993 when the volume went to the press. E. Ulrich and M. Segal independently claimed in 2000 that some or all of the 4QRP manuscripts contain regular Scripture. Without any specific argument relating to 4QRP, Ulrich stated “It is arguable that the so-called ‘4QRP’ (4Q364–367 plus 4Q158) is mislabelled and should be seen as simply another edition of the Pentateuch. There is still insufficient analysis to determine whether it should be considered an alternate edition of the Pentateuch or a post-Pentateuchal para-Scriptural work.”¹⁹ In general terms, Ulrich suggested that Scripture texts circulated in many shapes, all of them authoritative (SP, LXX, paleo-Hebrew and other scrolls from Qumran, 4QRP, the large Isaiah scroll, some abbreviated texts, etc.). In the same year, Segal stated “If these scrolls are classified as parabiblical texts, as they were by the editors, it is difficult to understand why the scribe felt the need to copy the text of the entire Pentateuch.”²⁰ Segal made this claim for 4Q364–365, which he named “4QPentateuch” and for 4Q367, which he named “4QLeviticus,” in his view being an excerpted Leviticus text.²¹

I changed my own views on 4QRP in 2005, not because of the claims by Ulrich and Segal, but in the wake of my analysis of the LXX versions of 1 Kings (3 Kingdoms), Esther, and Daniel (especially chapters 4–6), unrelated to 4QRP.²² I suggested that the *Vorlagen* of these three LXX books reflect a stage

19 Ulrich, “The Qumran Biblical Scrolls,” 76 (see n. 12 above). Elsewhere, Ulrich named this text “yet another variant literary edition of the Pentateuch, parallel to the traditional MT.” See “The Qumran Scrolls and the Biblical Text,” in Schiffman, *DSS*, 51–59 (57). Lange likewise asserted (without arguments) that 4QRP was “regarded as the word of God,” see A. Lange, “The Status of the Biblical Text in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process,” in *The Bible as Book*, 21–30 (27). At the end of his very detailed and insightful analysis, Falk remains undecided: “Whether 4QRP was intended to be read as a new edition of Mosaic Torah, or as some sort of interpretative account alongside Scripture is perhaps impossible to answer with confidence.” See D. Falk, *the Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 8 = Library of Second Temple Studies 63; London/New York: T & T Clark International, 2007), 107–119 (119).

20 M. Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch?” in Schiffman, *DSS*, 391–399 (394).

21 Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” 395 and 399.

22 The papers themselves were published later: “Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and

subsequent to that in MT. All three books were based on underlying Semitic texts that rewrote texts resembling MT, adding and changing major sections in these books. We also found several characteristic features in these three LXX compositions that are shared with rewritten Bible compositions from Qumran. Upon discovering these features, I realized that they have implications for our understanding of the LXX, several Qumran scrolls, and canonical conceptions in general. The three books, which I named “Three strange books,” include major secondary features, and in spite of these features the new texts were considered authoritative Scripture texts. After all, the Greek canon includes 3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel, which in my view constitute rewritten versions of earlier compositions similar to those now included in MT. The three rewritten books were considered authoritative in their Semitic and Greek forms, although by different communities. SP, likewise a rewritten version of MT, as well as its pre-Samaritan forerunners, enjoyed similar authority. Rewritten versions, as well as the earlier ones on which they were based (for example, the MT of 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel), were considered equally authoritative, by different communities and in different periods. In that study, I suggested that some of the rewritten Bible compositions from Qumran may likewise have enjoyed an authoritative status. We do not know if or how well these compositions were accepted at Qumran or elsewhere, but it is probable that at least some of the “non-canonical” books were accepted as authoritative by that community.

Keeping in mind that the LXX includes exponents of major rewriting that have become authoritative Scripture, we should thus be open to the possibility that 4QRP is a regular Scripture text that carried authority equal to that of the Hebrew texts underlying the LXX. While at a previous stage I did not recognize any parallels for the large exegetical additions, omissions, and changes of 4QRP, we have now found perfect parallels for that Qumran composition. This logic urged me, against my own expectations, to change my mind regarding 4QRP. I now consider 4QRP a Scripture text, or more precisely, a group of Scripture texts. Not everyone will accept this view, so that we should avoid introducing a new name such as 4QPentateuch. Indeed, in a recent study, Bernstein does not go as far as naming these texts Scripture, although he entertains the possibility

Elsewhere,” in *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* (ed. M. Karrer and W. Kraus; WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2008) 369–393; “The Many Forms of Scripture: Reflections in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch,” in *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of His 65th Birthday* (ed. A. Lange et al.; FRLANT 230; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 11–28 = chapter 1 in the present volume.

that 4Q364 is a biblical text.²³ His main argument is that “its <4QRP’s> radically free and highly idiosyncratic handling of legal material must be acknowledged to be possible in a pentateuchal manuscript” (p. 33).

Changing names in published Qumran texts is never a good idea, and therefore we should hold on to the name 4QRP. By the same token, we have to live with the name 11QTemple (better: 11QTemple^a), suggested by Yadin, rather than the possibly better name 11QTorah, suggested by Wacholder.²⁴ In the case of 4QRP, we should do away with the term “Reworked,” as the five manuscripts of 4QRP probably are simply five Torah manuscripts. By changing the name 4QPentateuchal Paraphrase to 4QReworked Pentateuch and then to 4QPentateuch,²⁵ although we do not suggest the actual use of this name, we move on to the third stage of its existence. We now turn to the question of whether these five manuscripts may indeed be considered regular Torah manuscripts.

Since we are no longer bound by the assumption that 4QRP was a nonbiblical *composition*, we should now regard these manuscripts as five separate Scripture *manuscripts* (4Q158, 4Q364–367), related or not.²⁶ When doing so, we need not refer to the question whether 4Q158 belongs to the same group as 4Q364–367²⁷

23 M.J. Bernstein, “The Treatment of Legal Material in 4QReworked Pentateuch,” *DSD* 15 (2008): 24–49 (48): “Are the 4QRP manuscripts biblical? My response after all this is ‘which ones?’ As I noted above, 4Q364 might very well be, but regarding the others I suggest ‘probably not.’”

24 B.Z. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1983); id., “The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature (500–164 BCE): A Classification of Pre-Qumranic Texts,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls, The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L.H. Schiffman; JSPSup 8, JSOT/ASOR Monographs 2; Sheffield, 1990), 257–281 (273–274).

25 This name was suggested by M. Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” 398.

26 If these manuscripts are taken as exponents of a single composition, we lack evidence for Genesis 1–20, Leviticus 1–10, Numbers 18–26, and Deuteronomy 21–34. In the case of Genesis, two fragments may present material from these chapters: (1) In his publication of 4QGen^k, fig. 5, J.R. Davila, *DJD* XII, 75 quotes J. Strugnell who suggests that this fragment actually belongs to 4Q158, and hence to 4QRP. This assumption is based on paleographical considerations, and since the fragment is very small, its provenience cannot be established easily. The text of this fragment deviates slightly from MT. (2) J.R. Davila, *DJD* XII, 62 suggests that 4Q8b (Gen 12:4–5), written in the same handwriting as the other fragments of 4QGen^h, possibly belongs to 4QRP or another rewritten text of Genesis. The text of this small fragment deviates slightly from MT.

27 Several scholars have suggested that 4Q158 needs to be separated from 4Q364–367: M. Segal, “Biblical Exegesis in 4Q158: Techniques and Genre,” *Textus* 19 (1997): 45–62; M.J. Bernstein in his review of *DJD* XIII in *DSD* 4 (1997): 102–122 (103–104); G.J. Brooke, “4Q158: Reworked Pentateuch^a or Reworked Pentateuch^A” *DSD* 8 (2001): 219–241.

since all the texts now reflect individual manuscripts. If these fragments are taken as individual manuscripts, the five manuscripts contain fragments of the following chapters:²⁸

4QRP^a (4Q158): Genesis 32 and Exodus 19–24, 30.

4QRP^b (4Q364): Genesis 2, 25–48, Exodus 19–26, Numbers 14 and 33, and Deuteronomy 1–14, but not Leviticus.

4QRP^c (4Q365): Genesis 21, Exodus 8–39, Leviticus 11–26, Numbers 1–36, and Deuteronomy 2, 19.

4QRP^d (4Q366): Exodus 21–22, Numbers 29, and Deuteronomy 14, 16.

4QRP^e (4Q367): Leviticus 11–27.²⁹

These manuscripts possibly contained merely some of the Torah books, as suggested by Segal,³⁰ while others may have contained the complete Torah. Thus, 4QRP^c (4Q365) contains fragments of all five books, 4QRP^b (4Q364) lacks only Leviticus, 4QRP^d (4Q366) lacks Genesis and Leviticus, while 4QRP^a (4Q158) contains only Genesis and Exodus, and 4QRP^e (4Q367) contains only Leviticus. The other Torah scrolls from the Judean Desert provide samples of both single-book manuscripts and combinations of two or three Torah books,³¹ and therefore the presumed coverage of some of the five manuscripts is wider.³²

²⁸ For details, see Tov, “4QReworked Pentateuch: A Synopsis” (see n. 2 above).

²⁹ It is not impossible that 4Q367 belongs to the same scroll as 4Q364, since 4Q367 contains only Leviticus, while no fragment of that book has been preserved in 4Q364. If that is so, the two groups of fragments would have been produced by different scribes.

³⁰ Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” 393–398 suggested that 4QRP^a (4Q158) does not belong to the same unit as 4QRP^{b–e} (4Q364–367) and that 4QRP^e (4Q367) contained merely a single biblical book, Leviticus.

³¹ For details, see *Scribal Practices*, 75.

³² The inclusion of more than one biblical book in a scroll is evidenced for 4, 5, or 6 Torah scrolls: 4QGen-Exod^a (36 lines; evidence unclear), 4QpaleoGen-Exod¹ (55–60 lines), 4QExod^b (= 4Q[Gen-]Exod^b; c. 50 lines), and possibly also 4QExod-Lev^f (c. 60 lines), 4QLev-Num^a (43 lines), and Mur 1 (c. 60 lines), the last possibly containing Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers (see *DJD* 11, 75–78). In all these cases, the spaces between the two books have been preserved together with some letters or words of the adjacent book, but in no instance has the full evidence been preserved. The large column size of several of these scrolls confirms the assumption that they indeed contained two or more books, since a large number of lines per column usually implies that the scroll was long. On the basis of the large parameters of these scrolls, it may be assumed that other Torah scrolls likewise contained two or more books: 4QGen^e (c. 50 lines), 4QExod^e (c. 43 lines), MasDeut (42 lines), SdeirGen (c. 40 lines), 4QGen^b (40 lines).

2 Textual and Exegetical Nature

The textual background of the five manuscripts differs.³³ Beyond the small textual differences between the five Qumran manuscripts and the other textual witnesses, we note that two of the manuscripts of 4QRP are close to the SP (4QRP^a [4Q158], 4QRP^b [4Q364]), while the other three are not. These two texts and 4QRP^c (4Q365) are written in the special Qumran scribal practice, while 4Q366 and 4Q367 are not.³⁴

4QRP^a (4Q158), more than the other 4QRP texts, reflects the major editorial features of SP in frgs. 6–8 as well as small details of SP in all fragments. Thus frg. 6 includes the divine command (Deut 18:18–22) to establish a prophet like Moses. Likewise, 4Q158 7–8, like SP,³⁵ interweaves sections from the parallel account in Deut 5:28–31 into the description of the Mount Sinai theophany in Exodus 20. The Qumran text and SP thus follow the same sequence of the verses. More precisely, SP was based on 4QRP^a (4Q158) or a similar pre-Samaritan text.

4QRP^b (4Q364), like 4QRP^a (4Q158), is close to SP.³⁶ This closeness is shown in two editorial additions that are characteristic of SP (Gen 30:26 and Deut 2:8), and in many small details. One of these small details is especially noteworthy, viz., frg. 11 2 Binyamin is consistently represented thus in this way in SP (MT: Binyamin).

4QRP^c (4Q365) is not as close to SP as was thought previously³⁷ since it does not reflect the editorial manipulations of SP.³⁸

What are the implications of the fact that two of the 4QRP manuscripts reflect the SP? As long as 4QRP was considered a nonbiblical text, we could say that it was based on a pre-Samaritan text in the same way that other nonbiblical texts were based on that text in part or in full, such as 4QTest (4Q175) in

33 For a detailed analysis, see my studies “The Textual Status of 4Q364–367 (4QPP),” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Madrid, 18–21 March, 1991* (ed. J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11, 1–2; Leiden/Madrid: Brill/Complutense, 1992), 1.43–82; “Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts” (see n. 6 above).

34 See *Scribal Practices*, Appendix 1 and *passim*. R.S. Nam, “The Case for Proto-Sectarian Ideology in the Reworked Pentateuch (4QRP),” *RevQ* 23 (2008): 153–163 recognizes in 4QRP traces of Qumran sectarian ideology, but in my view the proofs are not convincing.

35 The two are not identical. See E. Tov, “The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts,” *JSOT* 31 (1985), 3–29.

36 See Tov–White, *DJD* XIII, 192–193.

37 Tov–White, *DJD* XIII, 194.

38 Thus A.Y. Kim, “The Textual Alignment of the Tabernacle Sections of 4Q365 (Fragments 8a–b, 9a–b i, 9b ii, 12a i, 12b iii),” *Textus* 21 (2002): 45–69. See my remark in chapter 27, n. 25.

major details and *Jubilees* in minor details. Since the five manuscripts of 4QRP are now considered Scripture texts, the agreements of two manuscripts with SP in minor and major details may be problematic since the nature of 4QRP differs completely from that of SP. SP added many verses and sections to its underlying text, always by repeating Scripture verses occurring elsewhere. It also inserted contextual changes, almost always based on the context. On the other hand, the five manuscripts of 4QRP added details reflecting exegetical activity not instigated by the context. These two different tendencies cannot be reconciled, but nevertheless a solution is in sight. The five manuscripts of 4QRP are exegetical, and as such, they are based on different earlier sources. In this case, these earlier sources were pre-Samaritan texts.

The feature that characterizes all five manuscripts is their common exegetical character. Because of this feature, the texts were bundled together since there are no significant overlaps between the manuscripts.³⁹ Some of the major exegetical features (disregarding possible textual variations) are:

4QRP^b (4Q364). Before the Scripture text of frg. 3 ii 7–8 (Gen 28:6), 4QRP added at least 6 lines of text not known from other sources. This exegetical addition expanding the biblical story seems to contain material relating to Rebecca's address to the departing Jacob and Isaac's consolation of her.

In frg. 14 1–2, at least two words from Exod 19:17 appear before Exod 24:12 instead of the text of v. 11 LXX SP MT. The most likely explanation for the evidence is that the fragment does not present a sequence of Exod 19:17 and 24:12, but constitutes a freely rewritten text using elements of 19:17 before 24:12.

The two lines of additional text after Exod 24:18 (4Q364 15 3–4) may have described what God showed Moses during the 40 days and 40 nights, prior to his speech (ch. 25) at the end of that period.

Further exegetical additions and changes appear in frgs. 3 ii, 5b ii.⁴⁰

4QRP^c (4Q365) 6a ii and 6c contains the largest preserved addition in 4QRP reflecting a hitherto unknown poetical composition (Song of Miriam), preserved in part, following the Song at the Sea (Song of Moses) in Exodus 15.⁴¹

A similar case of juxtaposing laws dealing with the same topic pertains to the narrative and laws regarding the daughters of Zelophehad. 4Q365 36 (Num 27:11, 36:1–2) combines these two texts referring to the daughters of Zelophehad. 4QNum^b likewise fused Num 36:1–2, though in a different way, with the contents of chapter 27.

39 See *DJD* XIII, 188.

40 For a discussion, see Segal, "4QReworked Pentateuch," 393–394.

41 See G.J. Brooke, "The Long-Lost Song of Miriam," *BAR* May/June 1994, 62–65.

The first three lines of frg. 28 present Num 4:47–49, the last verses of the chapter, pertaining to the census of the Levites, followed by a blank line and the first verse of chapter 7 (“On the day when Moses had finished setting up the Tabernacle ...”). The miscellaneous laws that appear between these sections in MT (concerning lepers, adultery, etc. in ch. 5 and Nazirites in ch. 6) have been left out in this context, probably due to their irrelevance to the topic, which may be defined as the temple service.

4QRP^d (4Q366). The different sequence of the *Sukkot* laws is mentioned in § 1. Likewise, frg. 2 (Lev 24:20–22 [?], 25:39–43) adduces the text of Lev 25:39–43, referring to the freeing of slaves, immediately after the end of the *lex talionis* (Lev 24:20–22 is preserved).

4QRP^e (4Q367). In frg. 2 of 4Q367, several chapters of Leviticus are omitted between Lev 15:14–15 and 19:1–4, 9–15. The identification of the text adduced in these fragments is not without problems and, furthermore, the internal sequence of the components of the text remains difficult to understand. The missing chapters of Leviticus were not in fact omitted but adduced elsewhere, since Lev 18:25–29 occurs in frg. 22.

3 Authoritative Texts?

When we still considered 4QRP to be a rewritten Bible composition we said that we had little information regarding its possibly authoritative status. S. White Crawford struggled with this issue in 2000, after our *DJD* publication.⁴² While discussing the “authoritative status” of this composition, she drew attention to the possibility that *Jubilees* quotes from 4QRP^b (4Q364) 3, that 11QT^a quotes from 4QRP^c (4Q365) 23 and that these quotations may imply the authoritative status of 4QRP. However, at the end she leaves the question open,⁴³ although she leans towards the view that 4QRP was a “commentary.”⁴⁴

42 S. White Crawford, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” in *Encyclopedia of the DSS*, 2:775–777 (777); eadem, “The Rewritten Bible at Qumran,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Vol. 1. The Scripture and the Scrolls* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Princeton Symposium on Christian Origins 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 2006), 131–147 (142–144).

43 “4QReworked Pentateuch,” 777: “The Reworked Pentateuch may have been accepted by the inhabitants at Qumran as another version of the authoritative Torah or it may have been considered a rewritten version that did not carry the same authority. The question remains unanswered.”

44 “The ‘Rewritten’ Bible at Qumran: A Look at Three Texts,” in *Erlsr* 26 (Frank Moore Cross Volume; ed. B.A. Levine et al.; Heb. with Eng. summ.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society

There is no new evidence bearing on 4QRP's status as an authoritative Torah version at Qumran beyond what was known ten or twenty years ago. However, if we conceive of the five 4QRP manuscripts as separate Scripture texts, the questions asked are somewhat different. Were these manuscripts considered authoritative⁴⁵ in spite of their exegetical freedom compared with an earlier text like MT? If S. White Crawford is correct in assuming that *Jubilees* and 11QT^a quote from 4QRP^{b,c}, this may indeed be a reason for assuming the latter's authoritative status. However, the data do not corroborate such an assumption; it is more likely that *Jubilees*, 11QT^a and 4QRP^{b,c} reflect a common exegetical tradition.⁴⁶ But if we have no stable arguments for assuming the authoritative status of the Scripture manuscripts previously named 4QRP, it does not preclude the possibility that these five manuscripts nevertheless had such a status. In that case, the doubts regarding the five manuscripts are shared with the other biblical Qumran manuscripts. Phrased positively, we believe that all the Qumran Scripture manuscripts had an authoritative status. When making such a statement, we move the problem one stage back, since we now have to ask ourselves: "What is a Scripture manuscript?" We believe that the great majority of the 200 manuscripts listed as "biblical" (Scripture) in *DJD XXXIX* are indeed biblical. Much depends on each scholar's individual beliefs; I myself exclude from this list the Qumran Psalter texts, which I consider liturgical, as well as excerpted texts such as 4QCant^{a,b}. There is no need to address this issue in this study, since the individual manuscripts of 4QRP belong to a group different from these problematical texts, and in a way they are closer to the other manuscripts that we name proto-MT, SP-like, LXX-like, and independent. The default position for all these manuscripts is that they were authoritative Scripture manuscripts. For a detailed discussion of this issue, see my studies published elsewhere.⁴⁷

and Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 1999), 1*–8* (4*): "... 4QRP was perceived not as a biblical text, but as a commentary, an inner-biblical commentary on the text of the Torah."

45 When using this term, we refer to the status of a text as inspired Scripture with the implication that its contents were considered binding for the community that espoused that text.

46 The evidence is not compelling. 4QRP^b (4Q364) 3 ii 2 shares an expression with *Jub* 27:17 "and we see him in peace." 4QRP^c (4Q365) 23 10–11 shares the tribal order with 11QT^a XXIV; this order is not found elsewhere in Jewish literature.

47 "The Authority of Early Hebrew Scripture Texts," in *Journal of Reformed Theology* 5 (2011): 276–295; revised version: *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls x* (ed. J. Ben-Dov et al.; Heb.; Haifa/Jerusalem: University of Haifa/The Orion Center/The Bialik Institute, 2013), 57–71.

We do not really know what the members of the Qumran community thought about the textual variety among the Scripture manuscripts found in the various caves. Whether we assume that all the aforementioned texts were written at Qumran, or that only some were written there, while others were brought from elsewhere, the coexistence of the different categories of texts in the Qumran caves is noteworthy. The fact that all these different texts were found in the same caves reflects textual plurality not only at Qumran but also throughout Israel, probably for the period between the third century BCE and the first century CE.⁴⁸ Within that textual plurality, the large number of proto-Masoretic texts (in the Torah scrolls found at Qumran) probably indicates their importance, while the large number of independent texts (in the scrolls of other books) underlines the special condition of the transmission of the biblical text. Since there is no evidence concerning the circumstances surrounding the depositing of the scrolls in the caves or the different status of scrolls within the Qumran sect, no solid conclusions can be drawn about the approach of the Qumranites towards the text of Scripture. But it is safe to say that they paid no special attention to textual differences. This question probably never arose among the Qumranites, since they simply assembled different types of scrolls and used them on the same or different occasions.

In sum, the four manuscripts 4Q364–367 analyzed in the shadow of 4Q158, “4QBiblical Paraphrase,” were first named 4QPentateuch Paraphrase or 4QPP. Their first identity crisis was the change from 4QPP to 4QReworked Pentateuch, or 4QRP. The second identity crisis occurred when it was realized that this non-biblical composition might actually reflect a group of Scripture texts, possibly to be named 4QPentateuch. In 2005, I reached this understanding when analyzing three completely different texts, the Greek translations of 1 Kings, Esther and Daniel. I suggested that the *Vorlagen* of these three LXX books reflect stages subsequent to those in MT. All three books were based on underlying Semitic texts that rewrote texts resembling MT, adding and changing major sections in these books. We also found several characteristic features in these three LXX compositions that are shared with rewritten Bible compositions from Qumran. Upon discovering these features, I realized that they have implications for our

48 In recent years, the terms “pluriformity” and “uniformity” have appeared frequently in the scholarly discussion. See A. van der Kooij, “The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible before and after the Qumran Discoveries,” in *The Bible as Book*, 167–177 (170–171). All agree that at a certain point there was uniformity, but scholars disagree as to how this uniformity was obtained. The term itself, as well as “stabilization,” may be misleading, as these terms presuppose a certain movement towards that unity, which actually did not take place. For my ideas, see *TCHB*, 174–180.

understanding of 4QRP. Keeping in mind that the LXX includes exponents of major rewriting that have become authoritative Scripture, we should be open to the possibility that 4QRP constitutes a group of Scripture manuscripts that had the same level of authority as the Hebrew texts underlying the LXX. The main focus of our study was the second identity crisis of 4QRP. We sketched the textual and exegetical nature of the five manuscripts of 4QRP, and argued that these manuscripts enjoyed authoritative status even if this assumption cannot be proven in detail.

Some Thoughts about the Diffusion of Biblical Manuscripts in Antiquity

The purpose of this paper is to offer some thoughts on the diffusion of biblical manuscripts in antiquity and to find out whether our knowledge of the Dead Sea Scrolls aids us in understanding the state of affairs in the period when the scrolls were written as well as in earlier periods. The available evidence is limited, but nevertheless we will be able to obtain some valuable insights.

When speaking of the diffusion of the biblical scrolls, we refer to the number of copies that were circulating, their origin and possible patterns of distribution.

1 The Number of Scripture Scrolls Present at Qumran

The number of Scripture texts circulating in ancient Israel when the Dead Sea Scrolls were written is unknown, but the Judean Desert sites at least provide some clues for that region. Some 230 fragmentary biblical scrolls were found at Qumran alone and some 25 at other sites, totaling 255 scrolls. On the one hand, I would deduct around fifty from the list of Qumran texts that, in my view, are not biblical;¹ on the other hand, we would have to add an unknown number of texts that have perished since 68 CE. We therefore retain the number of 230 texts for Qumran.

In the last centuries BCE and the first century CE, Scripture books circulated separately, and while 230 sounds like a large number, these scrolls represent only individual books and not collections (complete Bibles, in modern parlance). This number equals approximately ten complete copies of the Bible if we calculate according to the traditional reckoning of twenty-four books in the

1 For example, I consider most of the Qumran Psalms texts to be liturgical and not biblical. See chapters 16 and 22 in this volume as well as my study “The Authority of Early Hebrew Scripture Texts,” in *Journal of Reformed Theology* 5 (2011): 276–295. By the same token, I would disregard scrolls containing only part of a book such as 4QDeut^a probably containing only the Song in Deuteronomy 32, and three scrolls containing only Psalm 119 (4QPs^g, 4QPs^h, 5QPs). All these are not Scripture scrolls in the usual sense of the word.

Bible. This would be a very rough calculation since the biblical books are represented in the Judean Desert in different quantities. For example, the Torah is represented more frequently in the Judean Desert finds than the other books.² Further, some books are represented at Qumran by many copies,³ while others are only infrequently seen among the Qumran scrolls.⁴

The number of 230 biblical scrolls represents the sum total of the manuscripts found at Qumran when the community was destroyed in 68 CE. Since the material of the scrolls was preserved for many centuries in the dry climate of Qumran, the 230 items represent scrolls taken to Qumran during the whole period of its occupation as well as those written on site. This calculation pertains to the six or seven generations of settlement at Qumran, from 100–50 BCE onwards, according to the revised chronology of Magness,⁵ until 68 CE.

We now turn to some speculations regarding the scrolls found at Qumran. These speculations are interesting in their own right, and also have a bearing on scroll production in ancient Israel as a whole.

The dates assigned to the Qumran scrolls,⁶ summarized in Table 1, reveal the presence of differing numbers of scrolls in the various time periods, which may be interpreted in different ways.

Starting with the earliest scrolls found at Qumran, dating to 250–200 BCE, an increasingly larger number of scrolls was found for each subsequent period. The peak years of scroll production, at least for those found at Qumran, were between 100 BCE and 50 CE, again in ever-increasing numbers. These numbers reflect the copying of scrolls at Qumran and elsewhere and they refer only to the production date of the scrolls and not to the date of their introduction to the Qumran community. Nevertheless, there is a striking correlation between the peak years of Qumran scroll production and the dates of Qumran settlement (that is, in their most comprehensive understanding, between 100 BCE and

2 Within the biblical corpus, a special interest in the Torah is visible at all the sites in the Judean Desert: 87 texts or 43.5 percent of the Qumran biblical corpus represent the books of the Torah. At sites other than Qumran this percentage is even greater: fifteen of the twenty-five biblical texts or 60.0 percent represent the Torah.

3 For example, Deuteronomy is represented by 30 copies and Isaiah by 21 copies.

4 For example, only two copies of Joshua and three copies of Judges were preserved at Qumran.

5 J. Magness, *The Archeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 65. At an earlier stage of the research, the occupation of Qumran was usually accepted as being from 130 BCE following the chronology of R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Schweich Lectures, British Academy, 1959; London: Oxford University Press, 1973).

6 The numbers are based on the list of B. Webster, "Chronological Index of the Texts Found in the Judean Desert," in *DJD XXXIX*, 351–446.

TABLE 1 *Number of dated
biblical scrolls
found at Qumran*

250–200 BCE	3
199–150 BCE	12
149–100 BCE	16
99–50 BCE	40
49–1 BCE	46
1–50 CE	51
51–68 CE	5
Sum total	173

50 CE). In other words, the greatest number of scrolls was produced, at Qumran and elsewhere, while Qumran was inhabited. This situation implies that most scrolls were used and read close to the date of their production. The presence of older dated scrolls before the assumed beginning of the occupancy at Qumran (100–50 BCE) requires a special explanation. The inhabitants must have taken these scrolls there. The relatively small number of early scrolls dating to the period before the beginning of settlement at Qumran (31 biblical scrolls) does not necessarily indicate that fewer scrolls were available in earlier centuries in ancient Israel. The evidence only shows that the inhabitants took with them a small number of such early scrolls. However, it is likely that fewer scrolls were indeed available in the century prior to habitation at Qumran. The equally small number of scrolls written after 50 CE may be due to the political turmoil in the country and the sudden destruction of the Qumran community. It is likely that fewer scrolls were produced in Palestine as a whole in those turbulent years.

The gradually increasing numbers of scrolls dated between 100 BCE and 50 CE show a growing scroll presence within the Qumran community, but this fact does not necessarily point to the diffusion of scrolls throughout Israel as a whole. Regardless of whether the main activity of the Qumran community was scroll production⁷ or whether the community merely produced and assembled scrolls in order to facilitate their religious activity, the fact remains that many

7 Thus H. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge and Leiden/New York/Cologne: Eerdmans, 1998), 51–55.

scrolls were produced at Qumran itself. According to my own calculation, the Qumran community, either at Qumran or elsewhere, produced at least a third of the scrolls found at Qumran.⁸ If altogether some 170 biblical and nonbiblical scrolls were indeed copied by the Qumran scribes, as I believe (see n. 8), this is not a large number for the 118–168 years of Qumran occupancy, averaging no more than one scroll per year.⁹

One additional factor needs to be considered for Qumran. It is natural that each subsequent generation would have possessed a greater number of scrolls, since they had not only the scrolls produced during their generation, but also those produced at earlier times. Accordingly, the scrolls left behind at Qumran in 68 CE represent the sum total of the scrolls taken to Qumran, and those produced there in earlier generations, including scrolls discarded but not destroyed during all those years. Indeed, we do not know how many of the Qumran scrolls had been discarded by the community and placed in a special place like a *genizah*, like the place under the floor of the synagogue at Masada where two scrolls were found.¹⁰

I now turn to the patterns of the possession of scrolls by the Judean Desert communities. At the Qumran site, which was probably inhabited between 100 BCE and 50 CE, biblical and nonbiblical scrolls were found dating to the period between 250 BCE and 80 CE, while most of them are dated between 100 BCE and 50 CE. As stated above, the dates of scroll production correspond with those of the occupation of Qumran by the *yahad*. A similar assumption pertains to the later Judean Desert sites that preserve scrolls dated *later* than the Qumran scrolls. Thus, at the sites dating to the Bar Kochba revolt (132–135 CE), Wadi Murabba'at, Wadi Sdeir, Naḥal Ḥever, Naḥal Arugot, and Naḥal Še'elim, scrolls were found that date to the period between 20 and 115 CE (see Table 2),¹¹ *averaging* to a later period than the Qumran scrolls. Table 2 also includes the Masada scrolls, for which the *terminus ante quem* is identical to that of Qumran, while the Masada scrolls have a later average date than those from Qumran.

The pattern emerging from Tables 1 and 2 is that the Judean Desert communities possessed both recent and older scrolls (those written earlier, 100 years

8 *Scribal Practices*, 263.

9 This point is stressed by P.S. Alexander, "Literacy among Jews in Second Temple Palestine: Reflections on the Evidence from Qumran," in Muraoka, *Hamlet*, 3–24 (6–7).

10 See my analysis "The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues," in Tov, *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 171–188.

11 XJude^a is listed in the table, but not included in the calculation since its place of origin is unknown.

TABLE 2 *Biblical scrolls found in the Judean Desert sites other than Qumran arranged by date*

Name	Dates ascribed to scrolls in the editions	Mid-point	Textual character
XJudg ^a	30–1 BCE	16 BCE	MT
MurDeut	20–50 CE	35 CE	MT
MurIsa	20–84 CE	52 CE	MT
XJosh	40–68 CE	55 CE	MT
5/6HevNum ^a	50–68 CE	59 CE	MT
XHev/SeNum ^b	50–68 CE	59 CE	MT
XHev/SeDeut	50–68 CE	59 CE	MT
5/6HevPs	50–68 CE	59 CE	MT
ArugLev	50–68 CE ¹²	59 CE	MT
SdeirGen	50–100 CE	75 CE	MT
MurGen ^(a) (published as: Gen)	115 CE	115 CE	MT
MurNum	115 CE	115 CE	MT
MurXII	115 CE	115 CE	MT
MasPs ^b	50–25 BCE	37 BCE	MT
MasEzek	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	MT
MasLev ^a	30–1 BCE	16 BCE	MT
MasDeut	30–1 BCE	16 BCE	MT
MasPs ^a	30–1 BCE	16 BCE	MT
MasLev ^b	30 BCE–30 CE	1 CE	MT

or more). We lack the necessary controls, and among other things we do not know which of the Judean Desert scrolls had been removed from general use (discarded) before being left behind in the first and second centuries CE. The Bar-Kochba sites contained scrolls that were no older than 100 years when they were left behind, but we also found scrolls there that had been written as little as 20 years before the revolt. It is unlikely that the Bar Kochba sites, which were inhabited by migrant communities, contained discarded scrolls, but it

12 See H. Eshel et al., “Fragments of a Leviticus Scroll (ArugLev) Found in the Judean Desert in 2004,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 55–60 (57).

would not be impossible. Accordingly, these communities moved around with relatively recent scrolls. Likewise, the inhabitants of Masada left behind in 70 CE a group of texts that were at most 85 years old, while some were written some 30–35 years before the destruction of the community.

At Qumran, we reveal a different picture. The Qumran community preserved many scrolls that were copied prior to their habitation at Qumran, and these scrolls remained there for the duration of the settlement. According to the list in *DJD* xxxix,¹³ no less than 86 biblical *and nonbiblical* texts (34 of which are written in the Cryptic A script) have been assigned a mid-point date before 100 BCE. These scrolls could have been taken to Qumran at any point during the settlement at the site, but they were likely taken there at the beginning. Most Qumran scrolls, however, were produced during the peak years of settlement. The modern concept of the turnover of older books in favor of newer ones does not apply to these communities, since old and newer scrolls were used in conjunction with one another. In the case of Scripture, it would stand to reason that older copies would be used more often than new ones, but we have no clues as to how the different types of scrolls were used by the Qumran community. We do not know whether the *yaḥad* members singled out certain choice scrolls for use by the community in its religious gatherings, while using other scrolls for private reading. Or possibly the members nevertheless distinguished between the different scrolls. For example, it would make sense for the members of the *yaḥad* to have used the large Isaiah scroll, which in my view was produced by community scribes, rather than 1QIsa^b when composing their community writings, but it is very hard to prove that assumption.

Returning to the concept of turnover, we do not know the community's approach to the various revisions of the *Community Rule*, the *War Scroll*, and the *Damascus Document*. If scholars would agree that the cave 1 scrolls represent the older copies, it would be a convenient assumption to surmise that that cave served as an archive for older copies, while the newer ones from cave 4 were in daily use.¹⁴ However, this is not the case, since scholars approach the relation between the cave 1 and cave 4 copies of these compositions in different ways.¹⁵

13 See n. 6.

14 D. Stoeckl ben Ezra, "Old Caves and Young Caves: A Statistical Reevaluation of a Qumran Consensus," *DSD* 14 (2007): 313–333 takes a different approach when studying "the average scroll age" of each individual cave. In his analysis, both caves 1 and 4 are "old caves" because he looks at the average age of all the scrolls found in a specific cave.

15 For some references to these views, see my study "Early Scrolls."

The Judean Desert communities possessed different types of biblical scrolls, making it even more difficult to describe the diffusion of scrolls in ancient Israel as a whole. However, the finds at Qumran illustrate certain aspects of scroll circulation; some types of scrolls were in greater circulation because the community or communities using them copied them more frequently than, or to the exclusion of, other scrolls.

The differing textual character of the manuscripts found at Qumran and at the other Judean Desert sites can be recognized best by contrasting the scrolls that are dated to exactly the same period from Qumran to those from the other sites, from 35 BCE (mid-point) until 70 CE. For this period, the communities at the Bar-Kochba sites and Masada possessed only proto-Masoretic texts (Table 2), while Qumran displays only a minority of proto-Masoretic texts (Table 3). Thus, the differences between Qumran and the other sites are not chronological, as is often claimed,¹⁶ but socio-religious. We have voiced this assumption also in the past (see n. 16), but have not shown its validity by contrasting manuscript finds from exactly the same period.

TABLE 3 *The scrolls found at Qumran dating to the same period as scrolls from other sites in the Judean Desert (Table 2)*¹⁷

Qumran manuscript	Date	Mid-point	Textual character
4QRP ^b	40–10 BCE	26 BCE	QSP + SP/ind
4QRP ^c	40–10 BCE	26 BCE	QSP + ind
4QRP ^d	40–10 BCE	26 BCE	ind
4QNum ^b	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	QSP + SP/LXX
4QIsa ^g	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	MT-like/LXX

16 The claim that as time progresses there is a growing acceptance of the proto-MT text, often expressed in the literature with the term “stabilization,” is not supported by the Masada evidence that is contemporary with that of Qumran (see *TCHB*, 174–180). Rather, it shows a predominance of texts identical to the medieval MT in contrast to the virtual lack of such texts at Qumran. On the other hand, Qumran preserves a great number of proto-MT texts that are *close* to the medieval text (see Table 3). For the distinction between the two types of text, see my studies “The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible” (n. 10 above) and chapter 22 in this volume.

17 The scrolls are arranged chronologically according to their mid-point. The following characterizations are used: MT, LXX, ind(ependent), “–” (insufficient data). In this table, “MT-like” refers to Qumran texts that are close to the medieval MT (see chapter 22 in this volume), while the MT texts in Table 2 are virtually identical to that text.

Qumran manuscript	Date	Mid-point	Textual character
4QDeut ^h	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	ind
4QDeut ^m	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	QSP + ind
4QPs ^l	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	ind?
4QJob ^b	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	–
4QDeut ^q	50 BCE–10 CE	20 BCE	LXX
4QXII ^g	35–1 BCE	18 BCE	QSP? + ind
2QNum ^b	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4QDeut ^{k1}	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP + ind
4QDeut ^{k2}	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP + ind
4QDeut ⁿ	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	ind
4QJudg ^b	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	MT-like
4QPs ^o	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4QLam	30 BCE–1 CE	15 BCE	QSP + ind
4QIsa ^e	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	MT-like/LXX
4QJer ^c	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	MT-like
11QPs ^b	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP + ind
4QCant ^b	15 BCE	15 BCE	ind
4QDan ^d	25–1 BCE	13 BCE	ind?
4QProv ^a	50 BCE–30 CE	10 BCE	MT-like
4Q[Gen-]Exod ^b	30 BCE–20 CE	5 BCE	QSP + ind/LXX
4QPs ^q	30 BCE–30 CE	1 BCE	ind
4QProv ^b	30 BCE–50 CE	10 CE	MT-like
4QRuth ^b	30 BCE–50 CE	10 CE	MT-like/LXX
11QEzek	10 BCE–30 CE	10 CE	MT-like
4QGen ^k	1–30 CE	15 CE	ind
4QExod ^j	1–30 CE	15 CE	–
4QDeut ^g	1–25 CE	15 CE	MT-like/SP
4QEzek ^b	1–30 CE	15 CE	MT-like?
2QGen	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	–
8QGen	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	–
2QExod ^a	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	–
2QExod ^b	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP?/ind?
2QNum ^c	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	–
2QDeut ^b	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	–
2QJer	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP/ind
3QEzek	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	–
2QPs	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	–

TABLE 3 (cont.)

Qumran manuscript	Date	Mid-point	Textual character
4QPs ^h	30 BCE–70 CE	20 CE	–
2QJob	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	–
3QLam	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	–
4QPs ^p	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	–
4QPs ^r	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	ind
4QpapGen or papJubi?	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	–
11QpaleoLev ^a	1–50 CE	25 CE	ind
11QPs ^a	1–50 CE	25 CE	ind
11QPs ^c	1–50 CE	25 CE	ind
5QIsa	15 BCE–70 CE	27 CE	–
2QDeut ^c	1–68 CE	35 CE	QSP?
4QDan ^b	20–50 CE	35 CE	ind?
4QGen ^c	20–68 CE	44 CE	MT-like/SP
5QAmos (= 5QXII)	1–100 CE	50 CE	–
3QPs	1–100 CE	50 CE	–
5QPs	1–100 CE	50 CE	–
8QPs	1–100 CE	50 CE	–
2QNum ^a	30–68 CE	50 CE	–
4QIsa ^c	30–68 CE	50 CE	QSP/ind
4QIsa ^d	30–68 CE	50 CE	MT-like/LXX
4QPs ^b	30–68 CE	50 CE	ind
4QPs ^e	30–68 CE	50 CE	ind
11QPs ^d	30–68 CE	50 CE	QSP?/ind
11QLev ^b	50 CE	50 CE	ind?
11QDeut	50 CE	50 CE	–
4QDeut ^j	50 CE	50 CE	QSP/ind
4QDeut ^{k3}	50 CE	50 CE	–
4QPs ^g	50 CE	50 CE	MT-like
4QPs ^j	50 CE	50 CE	–
4QPs ^u	50 CE	50 CE	–
6QpapPs?	50 CE	50 CE	–
2QRuth ^a	50 CE	50 CE	MT-like/LXX
6QCant	50 CE	50 CE	ind
5QLam ^a	50 CE	50 CE	–
6QpapDan	50 CE	50 CE	ind
4QPs ^c	50–68 CE	59 CE	MT-like

Qumran manuscript	Date	Mid-point	Textual character
4QPs ^s	50–68 CE	59 CE	–
4QPs ^t	50–68 CE	59 CE	–
4QGen ^b	30–100 CE	65 CE	MT-like
4QExod ^k	30–135 CE	82 CE ¹⁸	–

A comparison of Tables 2 and 3 enables us to determine that:

- 1 The Bar Kochba sites (Table 2), which are later than Qumran, naturally include a number of texts that are later than the Qumran texts;
- 2 Qumran contains a wide range of biblical texts of different textual nature, unlike the other Judean Desert sites that contain only proto-Masoretic texts;
- 3 During the period that Qumran was inhabited by the *yahad*, more scrolls were produced locally and taken to Qumran than before or afterwards. This point is further corroborated by the data in Table 4, which records the texts written in the Qumran Scribal Practice (QSP). This table presents the remarkable chronological distribution of the biblical scrolls written in the QSP.¹⁹

TABLE 4 *The chronological distribution of the biblical scrolls written in the Qumran Scribal Practice*²⁰

Qumran manuscript	Date	Mid-point	Textual character
4QQoh ^a	175–150 BCE	162 BCE	QSP + ind
1QIsa ^a	150–100 BCE	125 BCE	QSP + ind
4QSam ^c	100–75 BCE	87 BCE	QSP + ind
4QXII ^c	75 BCE	75 BCE	QSP + ind
4QXII ^e	75–50 BCE	62 BCE	QSP + ind
4QNum ^b	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	QSP + SP/LXX
4QDeut ^m	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	QSP + ind

18 In *DJD* XII (1994), 151, J.E. Sanderson asserts: “... is not impossible ... that this is a stray piece from one of the caves of the Second Revolt.”

19 See *Scribal Practices*, 261–273. These data were not included in my analysis in those pages.

20 The assumption that a scroll is written in the QSP is recorded in this table (sometimes with “?”) together with an indication of its textual character (“ind”, “LXX”).

TABLE 4 (cont.)

Qumran manuscript	Date	Mid-point	Textual character
4QXIIG	35–1 BCE	18 BCE	QSP? + ind
2QNum ^b	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4QDeut ^{k1}	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP + ind
4QDeut ^{k2}	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP + ind
4QPs ^o	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4QLam	30 BCE–1 CE	15 BCE	QSP + ind
11QPs ^b	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP + ind
4Q[Gen–]Exod ^b	30 BCE–20 CE	5 BCE	QSP + ind/LXX
2QExod ^b	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP? + ind?
2QJer	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP + ind
11QPs ^c	1–50 CE	25 CE	QSP? + ind
11QPs ^a	1–50 CE	25 CE	QSP + ind
2QDeut ^c	1–68 CE	35 CE	QSP?
4QIsa ^c	30–68 CE	50 CE	QSP + ind
4QDeut ^j	50 CE	50 CE	QSP + ind
11QPs ^d	30–68 CE	50 CE	QSP? + ind
1QDeut ^a	—		QSP
4QPhyl A	200 BCE–50 CE	75 BCE	QSP
4QPhyl B	200 BCE–50 CE	75 BCE	QSP
4QPhyl G–I	200 BCE–50 CE	75 BCE	QSP?
4QPhyl J–K	200 BCE–50 CE	75 BCE	QSP
4QPhyl L–N	200 BCE–50 CE	75 BCE	QSP
4QPhyl O	200 BCE–50 CE	75 BCE	QSP
4QPhyl P	200 BCE–50 CE	75 BCE	QSP
4QPhyl Q	200 BCE–50 CE	75 BCE	QSP

When taking 100 BCE–68 CE as the period of settlement at Qumran, the great majority of the scrolls written in the QSP were written within that period (22 texts). Only two scrolls were written earlier (1QIsa^a and 4QQoh^a).²¹ If the scrolls designated as QSP were indeed copied by the Qumran community, their

21 One scroll was not dated, and the eight *tefillin* are not taken into consideration.

assigned dates corroborate that assumption. A similar picture obtains for the nonbiblical Qumran scrolls (see the Appendix).

Remarkably, only four of the 134 *non*-biblical texts written in the QSP (see the Appendix) fall outside the chronological framework of the settlement at Qumran, viz. 4QDibHam^a [4Q504], 4QT^b [4Q524], 4QVisSam [4Q160], and 4QSap-Hymn Work A [4Q426].²² Circular reasoning in matters paleographical needs to be considered a possibility if indeed scholars were hesitant to date texts to before or after the assumed period of settlement. However, all the texts were dated before the publication of Magness's revised chronology (see n. 5), when scholars were still ascribing the beginning of the settlement to 150–130 BCE. At that time, very few scrolls were ascribed to 150–100 BCE (the fifty additional years of assumed settlement), which probably implies that no circular reasoning was involved.

These few facts about the Judean Desert scrolls represent the extent of our knowledge about the communities who left the scrolls in the Judean Desert. We do not know whether the Essenes took *all* their scrolls to Qumran for safekeeping at a certain point, in which case the total number of Qumran scrolls would give us an indication of the number of scrolls owned by that community.

An even bigger question is how the number of scrolls found at Qumran and the other sites in the Judean Desert relates to the total number of scrolls throughout Israel. Would these scrolls be a multiplication by a factor of two or ten of the number of the Judean Desert scrolls? We have no information with which to answer this major question.

Next, we turn to the question of the *ownership* of scrolls. In the last centuries BCE, with limited literacy, which was even more pronounced in earlier times, individuals would not have owned private scrolls.²³ Individuals did not have their own pre-Samaritan scrolls at home, or a copy such as 4QRP. I presume that Scripture scrolls were only found in intellectual centers such as the Qumran community, the Temple, houses of learning, and houses of religious gathering (synagogues). In these places, MT must have held a dominant position, and it must have been as dominant in certain circles as it was in the Judean Desert sites beyond Qumran. Even at Qumran a large number of scrolls were close to MT, although they were one stage removed from the text that was to become the medieval MT text. We do believe that there was a correlation

²² Ten texts included in the Appendix have not been dated.

²³ On the other hand, the evidence of 1 Macc 1:56–57 may indicate that at least some individuals did own private copies. In the religious persecutions of 166 BCE, copies of “the books of the Law” were burned (v. 56) and individuals who owned the “Book of the Covenant” were killed.

between the strength and influence of the communities that produced and circulated the scrolls and the extent of their circulation. Thus, the stronger the influence of the Pharisees, the more scrolls of their assumed making were circulated in Israel. At the same time, we admit that we do not have a clue as to the absolute number of scrolls circulating in Israel beyond Qumran when that site was occupied by the *yaḥad*.

One might ask from which sources did the *yaḥad* members take the scrolls that scholars ascribe to an extra-Qumranic provenance. Did they derive from a center of learning, an archive, or specific scribes? I believe that the cave 7 scrolls came from a special archive, since that cave contained only Greek texts. At the same time, we know nothing of the origin of the Hebrew biblical and nonbiblical texts taken to Qumran.

2 The Number of Scripture Scrolls Circulating before the Settlement at Qumran

In the first part of this study, we pointed out that the Qumran evidence provides some clues regarding the diffusion of manuscripts in the last centuries BCE and the first century CE. In the second part of this study, I turn to the number of scrolls circulating in ancient Israel in the centuries before the “Qumran era.” I submit that the Qumran scrolls may mislead our thinking about the diffusion of manuscripts in ancient Israel. The Dead Sea Scrolls attest to an abundance of texts in the last two centuries BCE and the first century CE, but the reality of earlier centuries (seventh to third) must have been a far cry from that in the Qumran era. If the first part of this study was speculative, the second part is even more so.

The only facts available regarding the diffusion of scrolls for the period before the settlement at Qumran is the presence at that site of three biblical manuscripts dating to 250–200 BCE and twelve that date to 199–150 BCE. Altogether, 86 biblical and nonbiblical texts (34 of which are written in the Cryptic A script) that have been assigned a mid-point date before 100 BCE were found at Qumran. There would have been many more manuscripts throughout ancient Israel in those early centuries, but how many? The further back we go in time, the fewer copies there would have been in circulation. We turn to some speculations regarding the number of biblical scrolls extant in ancient Israel in pre-exilic, exilic, and post-exilic times. This issue is usually not discussed in the literature, but one receives the impression that scholars conceive of a sizable number of texts. Any thoughts in this direction subsequent to 1947 were unconsciously influenced by the large number of scrolls found on the shores of the

Dead Sea, and prior to that year scholars were easily misled by the abundance of manuscripts of the medieval MT and of the ancient translations. Actually, very little attention has been devoted to the number of copies circulating in antiquity, since this issue is clearly beyond our textual horizon.

Exceptions to this trend are studies by Lohfink and Haran, whose main thesis of a minimal number of scrolls I accept. In an impressive study of the “deuteronomistic movement,”²⁴ Lohfink suggested that writing and book culture were not advanced in the *pre-exilic period*, and that in that era possibly only single copies of each Scripture book were available for long periods of time;²⁵ they were written and deposited in the Temple, and possibly further rewritten there.²⁶ 2 Kgs 22:8 indeed states that Hilkiah said: “I found *sepher hattorah*,” “the book of the law.”²⁷ This formulation may imply that the book existed in a single copy. In any event, there is no evidence, literary or archeological, for privately owned copies at that time.

Lohfink’s point of departure is the deuteronomistic composition Deuteronomy–2 Kings, but he turns also to the Books of the Prophets, which in his view likewise existed only in single copies, preserved by the students of the prophets.²⁸ This assumption thus precludes the circulation of the biblical books in the pre-exilic period. Likewise Haran suggested that distribution started only with the official acceptance of these books as authoritative.²⁹

There is no solid evidence in favor of the idea that in early centuries there were very few or no copies of the biblical books in the private domain and that such copies were found only in the Temple, but we consider the following arguments to be reasonably convincing.

24 N. Lohfink, “Gab es eine deuteronomistische Bewegung?,” in *Jeremia und die “deuteronomistische Bewegung”* (ed. W. Gross; BBB 98; Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum, 1995), 313–382 (335–347) = id., *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur* 111 (SBAB 20; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1955), 65–142 (91–104).

25 This suggestion was first made by Eichhorn, *Einleitung* 1 (4th ed.; 1823), 19 and subsequently by Steuernagel, *Einleitung*, 101.

26 “Es ist leicht vorstellbar, das sie <die Texte> bisweilen ergänzt und überarbeitet wurden, vor allem, wenn man sie etwa in der Tempelschule im Unterricht brauchte” (Lohfink, “Bewegung,” 338).

27 Thus the *NRSV*; not “a scroll of the Teaching” as in the *NJPS*.

28 *Jeremia*, 340.

29 In the words of M. Haran, “Book-Scrolls at the Beginning of the Second Temple Period: The Transition from Papyrus to Skins,” *HUCA* 54 (1983): 111–122 (113), in the pre-exilic period “... the people at large had no direct access to this literature, which was entrusted to special circles of initiates—priests, scribal schools, prophets, poets trained in the composition of psalmodic poetry and the like.”

- a. In early centuries, the literacy rate was very low, and this assumption makes it unlikely that there would have been more than a few copies of the biblical books among the public in those centuries (thus Millard³⁰ and Haran³¹). In the words of Millard, "While the number of ancient Israelites who regularly read and wrote may have been very small and mostly professional scribes, the number who possessed marginal literacy was larger, and still more would likely have been able to recognize and write their names."³²
- b. The story of the discovery of a scroll in the Temple during the reign of Josiah (2 Kgs 22:8; 23:2, 24; 2 Chr 34:15, 30) must be taken at face value. The book of Deuteronomy was kept in the Temple and was not known to the outside world.
- c. One of the theoretical models for the creation of most biblical books is a "production line" in a linear fashion, stage after stage. In this model, the creation by editor/scribe 1 formed the basis for an edition by editor/scribe 2, which, in turn was the basis for a creation by editor/scribe 3.³³ The alternative model would be the assumption of parallel versions of the same biblical book. Both abstract models have their internal logic, and therefore the only way to decide between these options is to see whether one of them is supported by textual evidence. I believe that there is no evidence for the option of parallel creation, and accordingly I believe that the production line in early centuries could only have been linear.³⁴ Linear creation necessitated

30 A.R. Millard, "Literacy, Ancient Israel," *ABD* 4:337–340.

31 M. Haran, "On the Diffusion of Literacy and Schools in Ancient Israel," *VT* 40 (1986), 81–95.

32 Millard, "Literacy," 340. The evidence for writing and reading relates to seals, tax collecting, owners' labels on jars, etc., mainly referring to the final 150 years of Judah's history. I. Young, "Israelite Literacy: Interpreting the Evidence," *VT* 48 (1998): 239–253, 408–422 (419) reached similar conclusions ("ancient Israelite scribes, priests and the upper class of society"). For an in depth analysis, see A. Demsky, *Literacy in Ancient Israel* (The Biblical Encyclopaedia Library 28; Heb.; Jerusalem, Bialik Institute, 2012), 297–324.

33 See Tov, "The Writing of Early Scrolls."

34 The main question for discussion is whether we can detect among the early textual witnesses any proof of the existence of two or more parallel versions of a biblical book that differed in matters of content. All textual witnesses differ in details created during the course of the textual transmission, but are there differences that require the assumption of independent writing or rewriting of a text unit in different sources? In other words, is there a chapter or part of a chapter of a biblical book known in alternative formulations? It seems to me that such evidence cannot be found, and therefore all differences between the textual witnesses must have resulted from a linear development, mainly the creation of a long text from a short one or vice versa. Focusing on the largest differences among

the accessibility of the earlier copies in a central location, and in fact a single copy sufficed for this purpose. Our description almost necessitates the assumption that all rewriting took place in one location, probably a central one, where books were written, deposited, and rewritten. Otherwise, it cannot be explained how any editor/scribe would have been able to continue the writing of his predecessor. The only such place I can think of would be the Temple. This center presumably had sufficient authority to prevent the writing of rival versions elsewhere. Besides, there is no evidence for parallel versions.

The suggestion that Scripture books were deposited in the Temple no longer needs to remain abstract, as it is supported by evidence in Scripture and elsewhere. For example, Samuel deposited a binding document in the Temple: “Samuel expounded to the people the rules of the monarchy (משפט המלוכה), and recorded them in a document that he deposited before the Lord” (1 Sam 10:25). The clearest proof for the depositing of books in the Temple is probably the story of Josiah referred to above.³⁵ Beyond Israel, the depositing of scrolls in the Temple, which runs parallel to the modern concept of publishing, is evidenced for Egypt as early as the third millennium BCE as well as in ancient Greece and Rome. In later times, rabbinic literature often mentions “the copy of the Torah (once: three copies) in the Temple court.”³⁶

Current views on the development of the Scripture books allow for and actually require the assumption of a single copy in the Temple.

1. Only a single revision is known of the historical books and Jeremiah in the spirit of Deuteronomy. Unrevised copies have not survived, and the best supporting theory for the Dtr revision would be centralized activity in the Temple.
2. Mere knowledge of the Torah, such as in the case of Hosea and Deutero-Isaiah, does not require physical proximity to copies of the Torah since tra-

textual witnesses, it seems that the long and short texts of MT (= 4QJer^{a,c}) and the LXX (= 4QJer^{b,d}) in Jeremiah, as well as in Ezekiel, Joshua, and the story of David and Goliath, indicate a linear development from short to long or long to short versions.

35 Whether or not all Scripture books were deposited in the Temple is a matter of speculation. In later times, probably all authoritative Scripture books were deposited there, but it is possible that previously only the legal and historical books Genesis–Kings were placed in the Temple.

36 For a detailed analysis of the evidence, see Tov, “The Writing of Early Scrolls.”

ditions circulated orally.³⁷ However, there must have been exceptions. The type of quotation from Deuteronomy made by Jeremiah,³⁸ which displays an intimate knowledge of Deuteronomy, makes it likely that the prophet in his role as a priest³⁹ consulted the books in the Temple. Likewise, Ezekiel the priest,⁴⁰ who had an intimate knowledge of Leviticus and Deuteronomy,⁴¹ would have consulted a copy of the Torah kept in a central location in exile. Indeed, when discussing Ezekiel's dependence on other prophets and the legal literature, Zimmerli goes as far as saying that Ezekiel had scrolls in front of him containing parts of the Torah and Jeremiah.⁴² Miller had reached similar conclusions earlier with regard to Ezekiel's use of Jeremiah.⁴³ Likewise, according to Holladay,⁴⁴ Jeremiah had the Psalter in front of him and adapted the text for his own purposes. Fischer goes even further: "At this point, it is possible to answer the remaining questions posed at the outset: Jeremiah shows literary rather than oral dependence on a good half of what would later become the Old Testament ..." ⁴⁵

In short, it is probable that in early centuries only single copies of the books were extant in the Temple and some of them were rewritten there. At an

37 For Deutero-Isaiah's knowledge of Deuteronomy, Dtr, Jeremiah, Isaiah son of Amotz, Psalms, and Lamentations, see the tabulations by S.M. Paul, *Isaiah 40–66, Translation and Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2012), 44–59.

38 For example, Deut 24:1–4 quoted in Jer 3:1–2.

39 Jer 1:1 "The words of Jeremiah son of Hilkiah, one of the priests at Anathoth in the territory of Benjamin."

40 Ezek 1:3 "The word of the Lord came to the priest Ezekiel son of Buzi, by the Chebar Canal, in the land of the Chaldeans."

41 For detailed evidence of Ezekiel's knowledge of these books, see R. Kasher, *Ezekiel, Introduction and Commentary* (Mikra LeYisrael; Heb.; Tel Aviv/Jerusalem: Am Oved/Magnes, 2004), 54–65.

42 W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), 44–52 (44, 45).

43 J.W. Miller, *Das Verhältnis Jeremias und Hesekiels sprachlich und theologisch untersucht* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1955), 118.

44 W.L. Holladay, "Indications of Jeremiah's Psalter," *JBL* 121 (2002): 254–261. On p. 261, Holladay asserts: "... the general outline of Books I–III of our present Psalter were in existence in Jeremiah's time (excluding any intrusive psalms, such as Ps 8 seems to be), and that scattered psalms outside these three books (exemplified for us by Pss 122 and 139) were in use as well."

45 G. Fischer, "Il libro di Geremia, specchio della cultura scritta e letta in Israele," *RivB* 56 (2008): 393–417 (417). See also, by the same author, *Jeremia, Der Stand der theologischen Diskussion* (Darmstadt: WBG, 2007), 134–143. The name of the analysis ("Was Jeremia vorausliegen dürfte") implies a written form.

unknown point, books started to circulate beyond the Temple, possibly when they were accepted as Scripture.⁴⁶ These developments must have taken place in the post-exilic period before the third century BCE, because at that time several copies were already circulating. Undoubtedly, the exiles must have taken Scripture copies with them, but we do not know how many copies left Israel and how many new ones were created in exile.

In sharp contrast, we note the relatively large number of copies found among the Judean Desert scrolls that relate to the last two centuries BCE and the first centuries CE. That number does not necessarily reflect the numbers available in earlier centuries when far fewer copies circulated in Israel. However, there are no hard facts about the period between the return from the exile and the third century BCE. We only know that a copy of the Torah was taken to Egypt in approximately 280 BCE for the translation of the Torah (according to the *Epistle of Aristeas*). Further details about the distribution in those early centuries are lacking.

Appendix

*The chronological distribution of the nonbiblical scrolls written in the Qumran
Scribal Practice*

Qumran manuscript	Date	Mid-point	Textual character
4Q504 DibHam ^a	150 BCE	150 BCE	QSP
4Q524 4QT ^b	150–125 BCE	137 BCE	QSP
4Q160 4QVisSam	150–75 BCE	112 BCE	QSP
4Q426 4QSap-Hymn Work A	150–75 BCE	112 BCE	QSP?
4Q175 4QTest	125–75 BCE	100 BCE	QSP
4Q422 4QParaGen-Exod	150–50 BCE	100 BCE	QSP
1Q28b 1QSB	125–75/85 BCE	100/85 BCE	QSP
4Q176 4QTanh	150–30 BCE	90 BCE	QSP
4Q257 4QpapS ^c	100–75 BCE	87 BCE	QSP
4Q428 4QH ^b	125–50 BCE	87 BCE	QSP
4Q443 Pers Prayer	100–75 BCE	87 BCE	QSP

46 Possibly more advanced technologies in the preparation of leather as writing material also played a role.

(cont.)

Qumran manuscript	Date	Mid-point	Textual character
4Q503 papPrQuot	100–70 BCE	85 BCE	QSP
4Q512 papRitPurB	85 BCE	85 BCE	QSP
4Q163 4Qpap plsa ^c	85 BCE	85 BCE	QSP
4Q502 papRitMar	85 BCE	85 BCE	QSP
4Q219 4QJub ^d	110–50 BCE	80 BCE	QSP?
1Q28 1QS	100–50 BCE	75 BCE	QSP
1Q28a 1QSa	100–50 BCE	75 BCE	QSP
4Q266 4QD ^a	100–50 BCE	75 BCE	QSP
4Q377 apocPent B	100–50 BCE	75 BCE	QSP
4Q382 pap para Kgs	75 BCE	75 BCE	QSP
4Q433a papH-like	75 BCE	75 BCE	QSP
4Q505 4QpapDibHam ^b	70–60 BCE	65 BCE	QSP?
4Q509 4QpapPrFêt ^c	70–60 BCE	65 BCE	QSP
4Q223–224 4QpapJub ^h	75–50 BCE	62 BCE	QSP?
4Q400 ShirShabb ^a	75–50 BCE	62 BCE	QSP
4Q405 ShirShabb ^f	75–50 BCE	62 BCE	QSP
4Q222 4QJub ^g	75–50 BCE	62 BCE	QSP?
4Q419 4QInstr-like Comp A	80–40 BCE	60 BCE	QSP?
4Q496 4QpapM ^f	55 BCE	55 BCE	QSP
4Q513 4QOrd ^b	55 BCE	55 BCE	QSP
1Q26 1QInstr	100–1 BCE	50 BCE	QSP?
4Q280 4QCurses	50 BCE	50 BCE	QSP?
11Q13 11QMelch	75–25 BCE	50 BCE	QSP
4Q522 Proph Josh	65–30 BCE	47 BCE	QSP?
4Q271 4QD ^f	50–30 BCE	40 BCE	QSP
4Q429 4QH ^c	40 BCE	40 BCE	QSP?
4Q221 4QJub ^f	50–25 BCE	37 BCE	QSP
4Q259 4QS ^e	50–25 BCE	37 BCE	QSP
4Q375 apocrMos ^a	50–25 BCE	37 BCE	QSP?
4Q416 4QInstr ^b	50–25 BCE	37 BCE	QSP
4Q427 4QH ^a	75–1 BCE	37 BCE	QSP
4Q438 4QBN ^e	50–25 BCE	37 BCE	QSP?
4Q460 Narr Work	75–1 BCE	37 BCE	QSP
4Q462 4QNarr c	50–25 BCE	37 BCE	QSP
4Q501 apocrLam B	50–25 BCE	37 BCE	QSP

Qumran manuscript	Date	Mid-point	Textual character
4Q292 4QWork Cont. Prayers B	30 BCE	30 BCE	QSP
4Q418 4QInstr ^d	40–20 BCE	30 BCE	QSP
4Q364 4QRP ^b	40–10 BCE	26 BCE	QSP
4Q365 4QRP ^c	40–10 BCE	26 BCE	QSP
4Q365a 4QT ^{a?}	40–10 BCE	26 BCE	QSP
4Q303 MedCrea A	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	QSP?
4Q398 papMMT ^e	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	QSP?
4Q401 ShirShabb ^b	25 BCE	25 BCE	QSP
4Q402 ShirShabb ^c	25 BCE	25 BCE	QSP
4Q418a 4QInstr ^e	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	QSP
4Q525 Beatitudes	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	QSP
4Q158 4QRP ^a	40–1 BCE	20 BCE	QSP
1Q33 1QM	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
1Q34 1QH ^a scribe A	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
1Q34 1QH ^a scribe C	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q159 4QOrdin	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q165 4QpIsa ^e	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4Q174 4QFlor	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q177 Catena A	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q181 AgesCreat B	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4Q227 4QpsJub ^c	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q251 Halakha A	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4Q256 4QS ^b	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q260 4QS ^f	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q267 4QD ^b	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q269 4QD ^d	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4Q273 4QpapD ^h	15 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4Q274 4QToh A	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4Q277 4QToh B	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q285 Sefer ha-Milhamah	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q394 4QMMT ^a	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4Q403 ShirShabb ^d	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q410 Vision Int	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4Q415 4QInstr ^a	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q417 4QInstr ^c	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q432 4QpapH ^f	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?

(cont.)

Qumran manuscript	Date	Mid-point	Textual character
4Q440 H-like Text c	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q473 Two Ways	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q474 4QRachJos	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q491 4QM ^a	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q254 ComGen c	25–1 BCE	13 BCE	QSP
4Q200 4QTobit ^e	30 BCE–20 CE	5 BCE	QSP
4Q215 4QTNaph	30 BCE–20 CE	5 BCE	QSP
4Q225 4QpsJub ^a	30 BCE–20 CE	5 BCE	QSP
4Q393 ComCon	30 BCE–20 CE	5 BCE	QSP
4Q397 4QMMT	30 BCE–20 CE	5 BCE	QSP
4Q186 4QHososc	30 BCE–30 CE	1 BCE	QSP
4Q396 4QMMT ^c	30 BCE–30 CE	1 BCE	QSP?
4Q511 4QShir ^b	1 BCE	1 BCE	QSP
4Q215a 4QTimes	30 BCE–20 CE	5 CE	QSP
4Q420 4QWays ^a	30 BCE–68 CE	10 CE	QSP?
4Q436 4QBN ^c	50 BCE–68 CE	10 CE	QSP
4Q268 4QD ^c	1–30 CE	15 CE	QSP
11Q19 11QT ^a	1–30 CE	15 CE	QSP
4Q166 4QpHos ^a	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP?
4Q369 4QPrayer Enosh	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP?
4Q414 RitPur A	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP
4Q423 4QInstr ^g	10–50 CE	20 CE	QSP
4Q435 4QBN ^b	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP?
4Q437 4QBN ^d	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP
4Q464 4QExp Patr	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP?
4Q471 WarText B	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP
4Q477 4QRebukes	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP?
1QpHab	1–50 CE	25 CE	QSP
4Q289 4QBer ^d	20–50 CE	35 CE	QSP?
4Q299 4QMyst ^a	20–50 CE	35 CE	QSP
4Q384 4Qpap apocr Jer B?	20–50 CE	35 CE	QSP?
11Q20 11QT ^b	20–50 CE	35 CE	QSP
4Q286 4QBer ^a	50 CE	50 CE	QSP
4Q287 4QBer ^b	50 CE	50 CE	QSP
4Q301 4QMyst ^c ?	30–68 CE	50 CE	QSP

5Q13 5QRule	1–100 CE	50 CE	QSP?
6Q18 papHymn	1–100 CE	50 CE	QSP
11Q12 11QJub + XQText A	50 CE	50 CE	QSP
11Q11 11QapocPs	50–70 CE	60 CE	QSP
1Q22 1QDM	—		QSP
1Q27 1QMyst	—		QSP?
1Q35 1QH ^b	—		QSP?
4Q161 4QpIsa ^a	—		QSP
4Q171 4QpPs ^a	—		QSP
4Q184 4QWiles	—		QSP?
4Q265 Misc Rules	—		QSP?
11Q27 11QUnid c	—		QSP?

The Aramaic, Syriac, and Latin Translations of Hebrew Scripture vis-à-vis the Masoretic Text

1 Background

Traditionally, text-critical analysis of *Hebrew* Scripture started with MT and SP, and since 1947 it also covers the Judean Desert texts. The picture must be completed by also consulting the ancient translations, even though the Hebrew texts behind those translations must be reconstructed first, and this procedure often involves an almost impossible enterprise. It is an accepted view that the Hebrew parent text of the LXX needs to be taken into consideration in the textual praxis, but we hear little about the other versions, T S V,¹ because V and T almost always agree with MT. They are less significant for textual analysis, but remain important for understanding the biblical exegesis in antiquity. Specialists find more variants in S, but they often state that S, also, differs very little from MT.

In this study, we will make some general remarks on these three versions, in an attempt to place them in their right position in the textual praxis. These three versions ought to be recorded in the critical editions of the Hebrew Bible, but in my view their status in the textual descriptions is in need of some refinement.² We wish to reiterate that V and T, as well as *kaige*-Th, Aquila, and Symmachus are virtually identical to MT, and to a great extent this also pertains to S.

At the beginning of the critical inquiry into Hebrew Scripture and its translations, scholars described the wealth of available evidence for the early text of the Bible as sources for an analysis. However, they did not necessarily have the critical insight to realize the different types of contribution made by these sources to our understanding of the ancient Hebrew text. A good example is the

1 The following abbreviations are used: T = Targum(im), S(yriac) = Peshitta, V = Vulgate. The earliest written evidence for these versions is available for the fragments of the Targumim from Qumran.

2 In this analysis, we exclude the Arabic translation of Saadia (882–942 CE) and the secondary translations made from the LXX: Latin (the *Vetus Latina*), Syriac (the Syro-Palestinian translations), Armenian, Coptic (Sahidic, Bohairic, Akhmimic), Georgian, Old Slavonic, Ethiopic, Gothic, and Arabic.

influential *Einleitung* of Eichhorn (1780–1823) that devotes 107 pages to the Syriac translations, 98 pages to the Arabic translations, 123 pages to the Targumim, and a “mere” 73 pages to the LXX.³ Many scholars still follow this egalitarian approach today, although the proportions differ, and the Arabic translations are given very little attention. An egalitarian approach is justifiable in general introductions to Hebrew Scripture since they also discuss the contributions of these versions to biblical exegesis, but their coverage needs to be limited in introductions to textual criticism.

A century ago, a great scholar like Driver realized the correct proportions for textual analysis by focusing on the LXX and paying little attention to the other translations of Samuel in his introduction to that book.⁴ He was able to follow the intuition of a giant like Wellhausen who in the introduction to his commentary to Samuel devoted 33 pages to the LXX, and none at all to the other versions as explained by him in the introduction to that monograph.⁵

In the following pages, we will deal separately with T S V and will return to them in a combined analysis.

2 Targumim

The Hebrew text reflected in all the Targumim is virtually identical to the medieval shape of MT. They reflect a few differences from codex L, but the underlying Hebrew texts of the Targumim differ no more from the medieval Hebrew manuscripts than these manuscripts differ from one another.⁶ At the

3 Eichhorn, *Einleitung*. In the 4th edition, the Targumim are discussed in 111–123, the translations from Hebrew and Greek into Syriac, *ibid.*, 123–230, and various types of Arabic translations, *ibid.*, 231–329. See further the analysis of the translations into Armenian (329–349), Ethiopic (349–354), “Egyptian” (355–375), Persian (376–383), Slavonic (383–384), Georgian (385–388), and Latin (398–437). The section on the LXX is contained in 1447–520.

4 S.R. Driver, *Samuel*. Driver dedicated 24 pages to the LXX (xxxix–li, lv–lviii) and only 3 pp. to the Targum (li, lxix–lxx), 6 pp. to the Peshitta (li–lii, lxxi–lxxvi), and 5 pp. to the Vulgate (liii–liv, lxxx–lxxxiii). The same proportions are followed in Roberts, *OTTV*: LXX 86 pp., T 16 pp., S 15 pp. and V 19 pp. and in my *TCHB*: LXX 13 pp., T 3 pp., S 2 pp. and V 2 pp.

5 Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuels*, 31: “... der Behandlung der Peshito, des Targums und der Vulgata. Ich habe diese sowohl durch ihren Text als ihre Hermeneutik in engerem Zusammenhange stehenden Versionen mehr benutzt, um an ihnen die LXX zu prüfen, denn als selbständige Zeugen. Als solche sind sie nur nach genauen Einzelstudien zu gebrauchen, welche ich deshalb nicht gemacht habe, weil ich den Gewinn für nicht so bedeutend erachtete, dass es nicht gerathen wäre, hinsichtlich der beiden ersteren auf bessere Texte zu warten.”

6 Below we refer to the statistical aspects of the deviations from MT in T.

same time, the Job Targum from Qumran deviates slightly from all other textual witnesses.⁷ Since the Qumran fragments provide the earliest evidence of the Targumim, it is possible that the other Targumim once deviated more from MT, but were subsequently adapted towards that text.⁸

The analyses of the character of the Targumim focus more on exegetical changes than on possible variants, as exemplified among others by Sperber.⁹ Sperber noted some 650 very minor differences between MT and T^O (in the Torah).¹⁰ However, these supposed variants are culled from different manuscripts of T, and many of them reflect contextual harmonizations and changes,¹¹ and therefore the number of supposed variants is smaller than surmised by Sperber.¹² For T^J in the Prophets, Sperber provided even fewer examples.¹³

Several scholars indicated the closeness of the various Targumim to MT, usually formulated as “The value <of T> with reference to M is not important to the textual criticism.”¹⁴

-
- 7 See R. Weiss, “Recensional Variations between the Aramaic Translation to Job from Qumran Cave 11 and the Massoretic Text,” *Shnaton* 1 (Heb. with Eng. summ.; Jerusalem: Israel Bible Company [M. Newman Publishing House], 1975), 123–127; idem, *The Aramaic Targum of Job* (Heb. with Eng. summ.; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1979), 27–30, XI; J. Gray, “The Massoretic Text of the Book of Job, the Targum and the Septuagint Version in the Light of the Qumran Targum (11QtargJob),” *ZAW* 86 (1974): 331–350.
 - 8 Alternatively, the milieu (not the Qumran community) that created the Qumran Targumim followed different approaches from those taken in the milieu in which the other Targumim were created.
 - 9 A. Sperber, “The Targum Onkelos in Its Relation to the Masoretic Hebrew Text,” *PAAJR* 6 (1935): 309–351; idem, *Bible, IVB: The Targum and the Hebrew Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 265–375.
 - 10 Sperber, *Bible, IVB*, 265–293.
 - 11 For this criticism, see Y. Komlosh, *The Bible in the Light of the Aramaic Translations* (Heb.; Ramat Gan/Tel Aviv: Bar-Ilan University/Dvir Publishing House, 1973), 121–123.
 - 12 Even if all the examples were correct, these variants would pertain to no more than 0.5 percent of the words of MT in the Torah.
 - 13 Sperber, *Bible, IVB*, 293–350.
 - 14 Thus P.A.H. de Boer, *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel 1–XVI, A Contribution to the Study of the Books of Samuel* (Amsterdam: H.J. Paris: 1938), 21. Likewise, Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis*; Driver, *Samuel*, lxix “The text deviates but rarely from MT.” Komlosh, *Bible*, 121: “Even though this list <Sperber’s, as quoted in n. 9> is very helpful, it does not provide a basis for proving that T^O used a text different from our MT. A great part of the changes is based on phenomena that are characteristic of the exegesis of T^O.”

3 Peshitta

The Hebrew source of *s* is close to *MT*, containing far fewer variants than the *LXX*, but more than the Targumim and *v*.¹⁵ Probably its greatest deviations from *MT* are in Chronicles,¹⁶ where clusters of verses are lacking in *s*, e.g., 1 Chr 2:47–49; 4:16–18, 34–37; 7:34–38; 8:17–22. This translation also contains a few substantial additions and differences (e.g., after 1 Chr 12:1 [doublet?]; 29:18). In several ancient (Jacobite) manuscripts, Job follows the Torah.¹⁷

In detailed studies of biblical books in *s*, scholars notice the closeness of *s* to *MT*,¹⁸ and in the case of a difference between the two, Maori would first

-
- 15 M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Syriac Translations," *EncBibl* 8 (Heb.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1982), 848 states that *s* is close to the late biblical manuscripts from the Judean Desert and the translation of Aquila. See further M.J. Mulder, "The Use of the Peshitta in Textual Criticism," in *La Septuaginta en la investigacion contemporanea* (ed. N. Fernández Marcos; Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros" 34; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1985), 37–53 (44–45); Y. Maori, "Methodological Criteria for Distinguishing between Variant *Vorlage* and Exegesis in the Peshitta Pentateuch," in *The Peshitta as a Translation* (ed. P.B. Dirksen & A. van der Kooij; Leiden/New York: Brill, 1995), 103–128 (103–104): "... several studies ... that the Hebrew text upon which *p* is based generally reflects the state of the Hebrew text in the first century CE, a text which differs from the *MT* only with respect to minor details." B. Albrektson, *Studies in the Text and Theology of the Book of Lamentations with a Critical Edition of the Peshitta Text* (Studia Theologica Lundensia, 21; Lund: Gleerup, 1963), 210 likewise stresses the closeness of *s* to *MT*.
 - 16 Thus M.P. Weitzman, "From Judaism to Christianity: The Syriac Version of the Hebrew Bible," in *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire* (ed. J. Lieuet et al.; London/New York: Routledge, 1992), 147–173; idem, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament: An Introduction* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 56; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 111–121.
 - 17 For the data, see R. Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and Its Background in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1985), 196.
 - 18 The following scholars find occasional variants in *s*: S.R. Driver, *Samuel*, lxxi: "The Hebrew text presupposed by the Peshitta deviates less from the Massoretic text than that which underlies the *LXX*, though it does not approach it so closely as that on which the Targums are based."; de Boer, *Samuel*, 42: "There is in our part of the work no reason to think of another '*Vorlage*,' than that which *M* offers as text, neither was this the case with *Tg*." M.P. Weitzman, "The Peshitta Psalter and Its Hebrew *Vorlage*," *VT* 35 (1985): 341–354; idem, *Introduction* (1999), 52–62; A. Gelston, *The Peshitta of the Twelve Prophets* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), 111–130; C.E. Morrison, *The Character of the Syriac Version of the First Book of Samuel* (MPIL 11; Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 2001), 1–3; G. Greenberg, *Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Jeremiah* (MPIL 13; Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 2002), 18–20; I. Carbajosa, *The Character of the Syriac Version of Psalms: A Study of Psalms 90–150 in the Peshitta* (MPIL 17; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 303–352; H.F. Van Rooy, "Agreement between

assume exegesis in s and only secondarily consider the possibility of a variant.¹⁹ Carbajosa notes 41 cases of extra-Masoretic agreement of s with other witnesses in Psalms 90–150, and only a single instance of a variant of s not supported by any other source.²⁰ s does reflect some variants in other books, but the relation of s to the LXX and T complicates any discussion of its text-critical value, since the wording of s may have been influenced by T or G.²¹ Indeed, some scholars believe that distinctive agreements between s and one of the Targumim point to the reliance of s on a written version of T.²² In other books, the wording of s is close to the LXX in exclusively common elements, but the background of these agreements is not clear. In Isaiah, the two translations may reflect common exegetical traditions,²³ while in Psalms and Proverbs the Syriac translation may have been based on the LXX.²⁴ Some scholars believe that s often relied on the LXX as a source of lexical information and exegesis.²⁵

LXX and Peshitta versus MT in Ezekiel: Some Important Examples,” in *Translating a Translation: The LXX and Its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism* (ed. H. Ausloos et al.; BETL 213; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 213–227.

- 19 Maori, “Methodological Criteria,” and *The Peshitta Version of the Pentateuch and Early Jewish Exegesis* (Heb.; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1995), 319–324.
- 20 Carbajosa, *Psalms*, 303–352.
- 21 Weitzman, *Introduction*, 129 summarizes as follows: “So far as LXX is concerned, polygenesis and common tradition do not suffice to explain the parallels with P. Some literary dependence of P on LXX must be posited, though not in all books and never systematically.”
- 22 See, among others, S. Isenberg, *Studies in the Jewish Aramaic Translations of the Pentateuch*, Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, Cambridge 1968; idem, “On the Jewish-Palestinian Origins of the Peshitta to the Pentateuch,” *JBL* 90 (1971): 69–81. See also the detailed analysis of P.B. Dirksen, “The Old Testament Peshitta,” in *Mulder, Mikra*, 1.255–297 (262–296) and the studies included in *Targum Studies, II. Targum and Peshitta* (ed. P.V.M. Flesher; South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 165; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992). Carbajosa, *Psalms*, 272–303 does not accept the assumption of the influence of T on s in the case of Psalms.
- 23 Cf. especially L. Delekat, “Die Peschitta zu Jesaja zwischen Targum und Septuaginta,” *Bib* 38 (1957): 185–199, 321–335; idem, “Ein Septuagintatargum,” *VT* 8 (1958): 225–252; J.A. Lund, *The Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta: A Re-evaluation of Criteria in Light of Comparative Study of the Versions in Genesis and Psalms*, Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1988.
- 24 See especially A.J. Baumgartner, *Étude critique sur l'état du texte du livre des Proverbes d'après les principales traductions anciennes* (Leipzig: Drugulin, 1890); Carbajosa, *Psalms*, 3–19, 187–272 for an updated survey of the views expressed and a detailed description of his own views. Similar dependence of the Peshitta on Th-Daniel was noticed by R.A. Taylor, *The Peshitta of Daniel* (MPIL 7; Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1994), 311–313.
- 25 For example, P.F. Frankl, “Studien über die Septuaginta und Peschito zu Jeremia,” *MGWJ*

4 Vulgate

v is important for the history of the exegesis of the Bible, especially when compared with Jerome's commentaries on the Minor Prophets, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, written between 406 and 420 CE. In these commentaries, Jerome often allowed himself to deviate from his earlier translation. When he wrote the commentaries, Jerome sometimes wondered why his earlier translation in the Vulgate differed from the Hebrew manuscript that was at his disposal years later.²⁶

The commentaries, as well as the translation, show that Jerome did not base himself exclusively on MT, but often was guided by the LXX, Symmachus, Aquila, and *kaige*-Th (in this order).²⁷ Therefore, when v differs from MT, the translation does not necessarily provide independent text-critical evidence (at such a late period, variation from MT would not be expected anyway). However, when v deviates from these sources and from MT, we may suspect variant readings, but such instances are extremely rare.²⁸ Several detailed studies of biblical books note that v deviates only rarely from MT.²⁹

I 21 (1872): 444–456, 497–509, 545–557; Greenberg, *Translation Technique*, 22, 143–168. R.J. Clifford, "Observations on the Text and Versions of Proverbs," in *Wisdom, You Are My Sister: Studies in Honor of Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm., on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday* (ed. M.L. Barré, S.S.; CBQMS 29; 1997), 47–61 (61): "Apart from OG, each version translated MT with the help of another version. S used LXX and T used S." Clifford further notes that Jerome used the LXX, Symmachus, OL, and S.

26 B. Kedar-Kopfstein, "Divergent Hebrew Readings in Jerome's Isaiah," *Textus* 4 (1964): 176–210 (209) suggested that Jerome used a slightly different manuscript for the earlier enterprise.

27 Thus F. Stummer, *Einführung in die lateinische Bibel* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1928), 123; J.H. Marks, *Der textkritische Wert des Psalterium Hieronymi Juxta Hebraeos* (Winterthur: P.G. Keller, 1956), 24–27 provides detailed proof of Jerome's reliance on the various Greek versions in Psalms. J.A. Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel* (1CC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927), 56: "It is fatuous to lay any stress upon v as evidence, where it agrees with one or other of the preceding vss"; W. McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*, vols. I–II (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1986–1996), I.xxxi–xxxiii. See further Clifford, "Observations."

28 See B. Kedar-Kopfstein, *The Vulgate as a Translation*, Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1968; idem, "The Latin Translations," in Mulder, *Mikra*, 299–338. W. Nowack, *Die Bedeutung des Hieronymus für die alttestamentliche Textkritik* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1875), 25–50 gives a list of deviations of v from MT.

29 B. Jacob, "Beiträge zu einer Einleitung in die Psalmen," *ZAW* 16 (1896): 129–181 (156); Stummer, *Einführung*, 123; Marks, *textkritische Wert*, 144: "... H auf einem Text beruht, der unserem MT im grossen und ganzen gleich war." Kedar-Kopfstein, "Isaiah"; idem, "Textual

5 Analysis

It has often been claimed that T S V reflect a text close to MT, and the present study focuses on the question of how close that relation is. Recent studies by myself have focused on the closeness of the various Hebrew texts from the Judean Desert to the medieval text,³⁰ making it necessary to expand these studies to the non-Hebrew sources that are close to MT. In my view, the Judean Desert texts from sites other than Qumran represent exactly the same tradition as the medieval texts, with the texts from Qumran being somewhat different.³¹

I suggest that T and V reflect the same text as MT and need to be seen as part of that tradition or family (S needs to be treated separately). They differ from the medieval manuscripts of MT as much as these differ from one another. This view was already voiced by Jacob in 1918.³² Such a claim is based on the above-mentioned analyses by specialists, as well as on my own findings and the statistical data culled from the critical editions in Tables 1–3.

I base my remarks on the references to these versions in the apparatuses in the *BH* series and the *HUB*. The analysis shows that these three versions are mentioned very infrequently in the apparatuses, and almost always in conjunction with other translations. On the other hand, the LXX is often mentioned with no other sources at its side. The *Three* (Aquila, Symmachus, *kaige*-Th) are also tabulated below.

a. The *HUB* is a good source for such an analysis since it does not provide evaluations of the text-critical value of readings. In my sample examinations of Jeremiah 1–3 and Ezekiel 1–3 in that edition,³³ I exclude several notations from the examination in order to obtain as good a picture as possible of the textual status of the versions:

Gleanings from the Vulgate to Jeremiah," *Textus* 7 (1969): 36–58; idem, "The Hebrew Text of Joel as Reflected in the Vulgate," *Textus* 9 (1981): 16–35. See further the remarks by Wellhausen quoted in n. 4. On the basis of his experience of preparing the edition of the Minor Prophets in the *HUB* Project, M. Segal, "The Text of the Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Materia giudaica* XII (2007): 5–20 (6, n. 4) notes that V "almost never diverges from the MT."

30 Chapter 22 in the present volume.

31 See chapter 22 in the present volume.

32 Jacob, "Beiträge," 156: "Denn von Aquila ab (ihn eingeschlossen) haben wir schlechterdings nichts mehr zu erwarten, was für die bibl. Textkritik von irgend welchem Belang wäre."

33 Rabin-Talmon-Tov, *HUB, Jeremiah*; Goshen-Gottstein-Talmon, *HUB, Ezekiel*.

1. Deviations from MT in translation technique phenomena, described as “re-current deviations” in the *HUB*,³⁴ relating to differences in person, number, prepositions, etc.³⁵
2. All variants mentioned in the apparatuses of the editions quoted in the *HUB*, diplomatic in the case of s and t, and eclectic in the case of v.³⁶
3. Supposed differences in vocalization and sense divisions between MT and the ancient translations.
4. Agreement of the translation with either *Ketiv* or *Qere*.
5. All instances of extra-Masoretic agreements between v = LXX or the Three and s = LXX because of the likelihood that v and s were influenced by these versions (see above).³⁷ Agreements between t and the others were included, but there were no relevant instances.
6. All instances that according to *HUB* are exegetical, including etymological exegesis based on the consonantal framework of MT.

When all these details are disregarded in our subjective reading of the apparatus, few notes are left in *HUB* that require our attention, mainly singular readings of v, t, and s and the Three, listed in Table 1.

34 *HUB*, *Jeremiah*, xvi. See also Tov, *TCU*, 154–162.

35 The *HUB* assumes that scholars are unable to express a solid judgment on the text-critical value of these deviations because in most cases the possibility of a variant cannot be excluded as shown by similar changes in 1QIsa^a. In spite of these complications the *HUB* believes that most of these instances reflect inner-translational changes void of text-critical value.

36 When basing ourselves on the text-critical choices of the editions of the ancient translations we make a choice, and it would be presumptuous to go against the specialists' views on these versions in spite of the imperfections of these editions. For the imperfections of the editions of Sperber (diplomatic editions of several manuscripts), see L. Díez Merino, “Targum Manuscripts and Critical Editions,” in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context* (ed. D.R.G. Beattie & M.J. McNamara; JSOTsup 166; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 51–91 (68–75). Besides, only rarely are manuscripts recorded in the critical editions as the sole witnesses for an assumed variant against the main text of the edition itself.

37 Thus already Steuernagel, *Einleitung*, 72: “Wo die in Textzeugen den Andern beeinflusst hat (z. B. LXX und Peschito), darf ihr Zeugnis nicht als ein doppeltes gewertet werden.”

TABLE 1 *References to possible variants in T S V and the Three in the HUB apparatus of Jeremiah and Ezekiel*

Jer 1–3	Small plus	Small minus	Difference	Inversion	Percentage of poss. variants compared w. total number of words: 1188
V	2:15	1:27; 2:9, 20	2:24 ³⁸		0.42
T					0
S	1:15, 18; 3:11, 22	1:17, 20; 3:17	2:12, 32; 3:4, 20, 21	2:27; 3:16	1.17
Aq		2:6?	3:3		0.17
Sym					0
Th					0
LXX ³⁹	1:1, 4 (2×), 7, 26; 2:7; 3:6, 9, 18, 23	1:3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 22, 24 (2×), 25, 26, 27; 2:3 (2×), 4, 5; 3:1, 2, 13, 14, 18	1:2, 3, 7, 8, 11, 23; 2:1, 3, 6 (2×); 3:1, 2, 3, 15 (2×)	1:4, 24; 3:21	4.12

38 תאנתה—*amoris sui*, possibly read as תאנתה.
39 The statistics also include two large minuses (1:14, 15).

Ezek 1-3	Small plus	Small minus	Difference ⁴⁰	Inversion	Percentage of poss. variants compared w. total number of words: 949
V		2:9; 3:1	1:18; 2:3		0.42
T					0
S	3:4, 22	3:4	1:8, 19	2:26	0.63
Aq			2:10		0.10
Sym	1:14		3:18		0.20
Th					0
LXX ⁴¹	1:9, 14, 15, 18; 2:2, 19, 28, 29, 31; 3:3, 8, 17, 18	1:3, 4, 10 (2×), 11 (2×), 13, 15, 17, 18 (3×); 2:1, 2, 7, 8, 17, 19, 22, 34; 3:1, 7, 8 (2×), 10 (2×), 11, 17 (2×)	1:1, 2, 4; 2:12, 16, 17, 19, 21, 26, 31; 3:4, 15, 19, 22	1:1, 4, 16, 19; 2:14, 19, 27, 30, 31; 3:2, 9, 16	7.06

b. The examination of the total number of remarks in *BHS* is relatively precise since it is based on the machine-readable apparatus of the complete edition,⁴² although the analysis itself is subjective. The main item analyzed is the number of references to the witnesses in the apparatus. In this way striking differences come to light, but it is realized that the very listing and its analysis depend on the views of the editors in the *BHS* series. The listing includes both meaningful and less meaningful references, such as “cf. v” or “v num.”⁴³

40 Several of the possible variant readings in v and s in Ezekiel pertain to formulaic expressions that were easily interchanged in Hebrew and in the translation and hence their status as variants is questionable. See *HUB, Ezekiel*, xvii (§ 31).

41 The statistics also include two large pluses (1:17; 2:28) and one large minus (2:1-2a).

42 Module in the *Accordance* computer program.

43 The listing for *BHS* thus includes many references that are irrelevant, and the figures are therefore much inflated (see Table 3).

TABLE 2 *References to sources in the apparatus of BHS in the whole Scripture*

Version	Number of references	Percentage of possible deviation from MT ⁴⁴
V	3362	1.10
T	3346	1.10
S	6785	2.22
Aq	300	0.10
Sym	415	0.13
<i>kaige</i> -Th (Th)	265	0.08
Three: α γ' , α λ'	9	0
LXX	14751	4.83

The data in the next table, Table 3, exclude certain configurations and are therefore more meaningful. The logic of the exclusion of these data is that two translations were very likely influenced by others: Jerome (v) often consulted the LXX and the Three, and s may have been based on either the LXX or T or both.

The results of the electronic searches in *BHS* run parallel to the manual searches in *HUB* in these apparatuses (Table 1) as well as to the research performed on these translations. v, t, and s are rarely mentioned alone in text-critical analyses. By comparing the data in Table 1 with those in Table 2, we note that v is mentioned altogether 3362 times (variation rate from MT of at most 1.1 percent) in the apparatus of *BHS* (Table 2), but merely 160 times (variation rate 0.05 percent) without the LXX and the Three. These figures show that the evidence of v as recorded in *BHS* is more or less negligible. Likewise, the various Targumim together are mentioned 3346 times together with the other sources (variation rate from MT of at most 1.1 percent). s may reflect a greater deviation from MT with 6785 references in the *BHS* apparatus (variation rate of at most 2.22 percent from MT). However, it is more realistic to take into consideration the possible influence from the LXX and T on s, in which case the percentage drops to 0.40, and if only the LXX is disregarded, the maximum degree of variation of s is 0.57 %.

44 Based on a number of 305,490 words in Hebrew Scripture.

TABLE 3 *References to v and s in the apparatus of BHS with select groups excluded*

Reference to translation	Groups excluded ⁴⁵	Number of remaining references	Percentage of possible deviation from MT ⁴⁶
V	LXX, οί γ', οί λ', Aq, Sym, Th	160	0.05
S	LXX T	1222	0.40
S	LXX	1742	0.57

6 Conclusions

Since the Hebrew text underlying T S V was virtually identical to the unvocalized medieval MT and the ancient proto-Masoretic text, scholarly analyses and critical editions only rarely mention deviations from MT in these versions. The small number of references to these versions must be contrasted with the large number of references to the LXX and the Dead Sea Scrolls.

We consider T S V to be within the realm of MT because of the small number of differences from codex L. The low level of deviation of T S V from codex L is similar to that of the differences between codex L and the other medieval manuscripts. The level of deviation of T S V in the critical editions can be expressed statistically, but we realize that the automatically gathered information merely gives an impression of the relations between the sources. T S V differ as much from the medieval manuscripts of MT as these manuscripts differ from one another.

All these remarks also pertain to the Three, mentioned together or individually in the sources. The Three are actually revisions of the LXX, but since

45 A reference to v or s was excluded if that translation is mentioned in the apparatus in conjunction with one or more of the sources mentioned in this column. The logic followed in the search is that the additional translations are mentioned within ten positions of the translation that is the topic of the search. This type of search occasionally creates an imprecision when the search contains data mentioned in the next lemma, but this imprecision occurs across the board and therefore does not skew the results.

46 Each note usually refers to a single word in the text. When the total number of references to a translation is compared with the total number of words in Hebrew Scripture (305.490), we obtain a percentage of possible variation of that translation in relation to MT. This figure is very general since not every note records a variant reading.

they are mentioned separately in the textual apparatus, we treat them accordingly.

I referred to T S V in the chronological sequence in which these translations were put into final writing.⁴⁷ When taking into consideration the late dates of all these sources, we would not have expected any other relation between the sources. When studying the development of Hebrew Scripture in Judaism, we simply do not find any Hebrew or translated sources after 70 CE or 100 CE that differ significantly from MT. As a result, translations of Hebrew Scripture made after that date necessarily reflect MT. Jerome himself said that he obtained manuscripts of Hebrew Scripture from a rabbi and at that time, around 400, we know of no sources that deviate from MT. T and S were finalized after that date.

If our analysis is correct, we can safely assume that V, T, and the Three, and probably also S, reflect the same text as the medieval shape of MT. The earliest representatives of MT were found in the Judean Desert: Wadi Murabba'at, Wadi Sdeir, Naḥal Ḥever, Naḥal Arugot, and Naḥal Şe'elim, dating to the period of the Bar-Kochba Revolt in 132–135 CE (texts written between 20 CE and 115 CE), while similar texts were found at Qumran dating to an earlier period, from 250 BCE onwards. The Judean Desert texts differ as much from the medieval manuscripts as they differ from one another. Since the proto-Masoretic text was the only text used in Judaism after a certain time, definitely from 70 CE onwards, it was to be expected that T S V and the Three would reflect that text. The mentioned texts virtually count as one together with MT.

47 The earlier stages of T and S were partially oral and partially written (see the Qumran evidence for T). The Targum of Job from Qumran cave 11 dates to the middle of the first century CE.

Computer-Assisted Tools for Textual Criticism

Since the end of the twentieth century, the study of textual criticism has been aided greatly by computer-assisted tools and research. Such tools consist of flexible, interactive databases and programs that aid the researcher in obtaining and analyzing data, while computer-assisted research presents non-flexible¹ results of investigations that were compiled with the aid of machine-readable data. The latter type of research will not be referred to in this study. It is probably true to say that involvement in textual criticism is virtually impossible in the twenty-first century without the aid of electronic tools. An ever-increasing number of Bible computer modules and databases are becoming available and the possibilities for using them profitably within existing or custom-made programs are expanding. This increasing availability enables several types of data retrieval, and allows scholars to access data and formulate conclusions that would not have been possible with the conventional research methods. The present study briefly describes the available data, but it should be remembered that there is ongoing development in this area and some of the statements in the following pages may be in need of updating.

I single out the following areas for special attention:

- (1) *Textual analysis*
- (2) *Linguistic analysis*
- (3) *The human factor in the study of orthography*. One of the most promising areas for computer-assisted research of textual sources is that of orthography, which is technically part of the linguistic analysis. The results seem to be quite stable, but even within this area two scholars will not reach the same results if they use different base texts, a different morphological analysis, or define the searches differently. In the examples below, the tables mention first the results reached with the aid of the *Accordance* program and subsequently those of Andersen–Forbes, *Spelling*.

1 This term refers to the results of research that was performed with the aid of computers, while the computer files or computer applications are not accessible to the researcher, and as a result the user cannot work with the data themselves. A good example of this research is contained in the valuable studies of F.I. Andersen & A.D. Forbes, *Spelling in the Hebrew Bible* (BibOr 41; Rome, 1986) and *The Vocabulary of the Old Testament* (Rome, 1989). For a listing of some results of computer-assisted research in the area of textual criticism, see E. Tov, “The Use of Computers in Biblical Research,” *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 228–246.

1 **Spelling of the Feminine Plural Participle in All Conjugations**

TABLE 1 Feminine plural participle in *MT* based on Accordance²

	Occurrences	Defective	<i>Plene</i>	Percentage of <i>plene</i>
Torah	58	45	13	22.41
Former Prophets	28	2	26	92.85
Latter Prophets	102	6	96	94.11
Hagiographa	68	0	68	100.00

TABLE 2 Feminine plural ending in *MT* in nouns, adjectives, numerals, and participles according to Andersen–Forbes, *Spelling*, 11

	Occurrences	Defective	<i>Plene</i>	Percentage of <i>plene</i>
Torah	1732	1188	544	31.40
Former Prophets	1060	276	784	74.00
Latter Prophets	1945	299	1646	86.40
Hagiographa	2141	424	1717	80.20

The main difference between the two searches is the definition of the area searched. Andersen–Forbes, *Spelling*, cover a much larger sample including participles as well as nouns, adjectives, and numerals. However, the different behavior of the spelling of these groups requires a more narrowly defined search procedure that excludes nouns, adjectives, and numerals.³ Our own statistics are limited to the feminine plural participle in all conjugations, and while they point in the same direction as the results of Andersen–Forbes, *Spelling*, they reflect more clearly the difference between the Torah and the other books.

2 Words with pronominal suffixes are excluded. The defective/*plene* spelling of the first syllable of *qotlot*, which in some instances possibly influences the writing of the last syllable, has not been recorded.

3 Both the *Accordance* search and that of Andersen–Forbes, *Spelling*, 12 exclude words containing a pronominal suffix since the addition of prefixes or suffixes creates what J. Barr, *The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible* (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1989), 14, 25–32 names the “affix effect.” In this condition, words that are otherwise spelled *plene* lose their *mater lectionis* in the final syllable when an element is affixed to the word.

TABLE 3 Feminine plural participle *in the biblical Qumran scrolls based on the resident module*⁴ in Accordance

	Occurrences	Defective	<i>Plene</i>	Percentage of <i>plene</i>
Qumran scrolls	61	6	55	90.00

TABLE 4 Feminine plural participle *in SP based on* Accordance

Condition	Occurrences	Percentage
SP <i>plene</i> (MT defective)	43	75.43 <i>plene</i>
SP <i>plene</i> (MT <i>plene</i>)	10	17.54 <i>plene</i>
SP defective (MT defective)	3	5.26 defective
SP defective (MT <i>plene</i>)	1	1.75 defective
Total:	57 cases ⁵	

Table 3 shows that the biblical Qumran scrolls reflect the same tendency as the post-Pentateuchal books in MT.

SP reflects the trend of the *plene* spellings in the post-Pentateuchal books rather than the defective spellings in the Torah in MT.

The books of the Prophets and Hagiographa in MT, the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls, and SP reflect the same *plene* spelling, with internal differences, while the Torah in MT has a defective spelling for the feminine plural participle in all conjugations.

2 Spelling of the Word “Three”

For the spelling of the word “three,” different procedures can be followed. The more comprehensively the search procedure is defined, progressively fewer differences come to light.

⁴ Prepared by M.G. Abegg.

⁵ Lev 26:16a, reflecting a different reading in the Samaritan Pentateuch, is disregarded.

TABLE 5 All spellings of “three” in *MT* as presented by Andersen–Forbes, *Spelling*, 9⁶

	Occurrences	Defective	<i>Plene</i>	Percentage of <i>plene</i>
Torah	179	176	3	1.7
Former Prophets	181	179	2	1.1
Latter Prophets	53	48	5	9.4
Hagiographa	185	135	50	27.0
Totals	598	538	60	10.0

TABLE 6A All spellings of “three” in *MT* based on Accordance

	Occurrences	Defective	<i>Plene</i>	Percentage of <i>plene</i>
Torah	183	180	3	1.63
Former Prophets	183	181	2	1.09
Latter Prophets	55	52	3	5.45
Hagiographa	185	136	49	26.48
Totals	606	549	57	9.40

The statistics in Table 6a are rather close to those of Andersen–Forbes, *Spelling*, presented in Table 5. They are not very meaningful since של(ו)שים and של(ו)שת behave differently from the other forms because of the “affix effect”:⁷ when an element is affixed to the base word, even in the fuller spelling system of the later books, the base word becomes defective.⁸ Therefore, in the following tables these words are excluded.

6 All vocalisations of של(ו)ש, של(ו)שה, and של(ו)שת as well as של(ו)שים are included in Tables 5 and 6a.

7 See Barr, *Variable Spellings*, 14, 25–32.

8 By excluding של(ו)שים, we obtain a clearer distinction between the Hagiographa and the other books. Because of the “affix effect,” של(ו)שים is usually spelled defectively in the Hagiographa (38 times, 7 times *plene*), against the general trend of these books. Table 6c is therefore more meaningful than the other tables.

TABLE 6B Spelling of “three” (excluding של(ו)שים in MT based on Accordance⁹

	Occurrences	Defective	Plene	Percentage of <i>plene</i>
Torah	108	105	3	2.77
Former Prophets	125	123	2	1.60
Latter Prophets	45	42	3	6.66
Hagiographa	129	94	37	27.13

TABLE 6C Spelling of “three” (excluding של(ו)ש and של(ו)שה in MT based on Accordance¹⁰

	Occurrences	Defective	Plene	Percentage of <i>plene</i>
Torah	83	80	3	3.61
Former Prophets	85	83	2	2.35
Latter Prophets	36	32	4	11.11
Hagiographa	104	67	37	35.57
Among which:				
Job	4	3	4	75.00
Prov	4	2	2	50.00
Esth	8	3	5	60.00
Dan	6	3	3	50.00
Chron	52	32	20	38.46

The spelling of “three” in Job, Proverbs, Esther, Daniel, and Chronicles, and less so in the Hagiographa as a whole, differs significantly from the other Scripture books.

3 Spelling of קול (Sing.) with Pronominal Suffixes

According to the searches in *Accordance*, קול “voice”¹¹ in the singular occurs 493 times in Hebrew Scripture, 443 times *plene* and 50 times defective, with

9 All vocalizations of של(ו)ש, של(ו)שה, and של(ו)שת are included, but not של(ו)שים.

10 All vocalizations of של(ו)ש and של(ו)שה are included, while של(ו)שת and של(ו)שים are excluded.

11 One should be careful to distinguish between *qol* “voice” and *qol* “lightness,” the latter occurring only in Jer 3:9 (defective: קל).

TABLE 7 Spelling of ק(ו)ל (sing.) with suffixes and prefixes in MT based on Accordance

	Total	Percentage	No suff/ pref	Suffix and prefix	Prefix only
Torah					
Defective	38	40.0	0	33	5
Plene	57	60.0	28	6	23
Total	95	100.0	28	39	28
Former Prophets					
Defective	8	8.7	0	8	0
Plene	84	91.3	30	26	28
Total	92	100.0	30	34	28
Latter Prophets					
Defective	0	0	0	0	0
Plene	174	100.0	69	36	69
Total	174	100.0	69	36	69
Hagiographa					
Defective	4	3.0	0	4	0
Plene	128	97.0	46	38	44
Total	132	100.0	46	42	44

and without pronominal suffixes. The internal division of these spellings is presented in Table 7.

In the Torah, the preferred spelling for *qol* is *plene*, including words with prefixes (ה, ו, ב, ל, [ל]מ). When a suffix is added to the noun, the preferred spelling of the noun becomes defective. On the other hand, in the Former Prophets, Latter Prophets, and the Hagiographa, the preferred spelling is *plene* in both conditions.¹² With five exceptions,¹³ the nonbiblical and biblical Qumran scrolls always present the *plene* form of this word.

12 Andersen–Forbes, *Spelling*, 47–48 analyzes only the suffixed forms of *qol*, which are presented there in a somewhat different way. Barr, *Variable Spellings*, pp. 50–51 records only the plural forms of *qol*.

13 4QGen^j (Gen 45:16); 4QPs^m (Ps 95:7); 4QJob^a (Job 37:2); 4QCant^b (Cant 2:12, 14).

Conclusions

Since the end of the twentieth century, the study of textual criticism has been aided greatly by computer-assisted tools and research. The present study briefly describes the available modules, categories of information, and predetermined information included in computer databases and programs. The area that is best covered in the computer modules is that of morphological analysis, followed by syntactical analysis. While caution is in order because of the human factor behind the data input and the definition of the search categories, computer-assisted research has become an integral part of textual criticism. In linguistic analysis, which often has bearing on textual criticism (including the study of orthography), one should start the research with computerized databases and supplement with printed tools. This pertains also to other areas of textual criticism, but in most cases the databases have not yet been sufficiently developed. The subjectivity of the recording of the data, which comes to light in the results of the searches, is illustrated by computer-assisted examinations of spelling patterns.

The Chapter and Section Divisions in Esther

The purpose of this study is to examine how the content of a biblical book is divided with different types of divisions. We chose the little book of Esther for this purpose because of its small size (10 chapters), focusing on the subjective aspects of these divisions. No ancient fragments of Esther have been found among the texts in the Judean Desert or elsewhere, and as a result the discussion focuses on the medieval manuscripts, some modern editions, and some commentaries.

1 Chapter Divisions

The chapter division of the Bible derives from the Middle Ages,¹ and since it was applied first to the Vulgate and only secondarily to Hebrew sources, its logic is detached from the traditional Jewish section division.

In order to present the chapter divisions, we start the analysis with the lucid presentation of the content of the book in a modern commentary, viz., that by Omanson–Noss.² Like most other scholars, Omanson–Noss reckon with a larger number of units than the ten traditional chapters.

Adapted to the traditional chapter structure, the topics of the chapters would be as follows according to Omanson–Noss.

Focusing on the logic of the chapter division in Esther, we consider it generally to be meaningful, consisting of a number of units in each chapter, as elsewhere in Scripture. The chapter divisions in Tables 1 and 2 are unproblematic in most instances, the only questionable aspect being the transition between chapters 6 and 7. Omanson–Noss transferred the last verse of chapter

1 The division into chapters was established around 1204–1205 by Archbishop Stephen Langton from Canterbury, England (who also lectured at the University of Paris), probably on the basis of divisions accredited to an earlier Archbishop, Lanfranc (died 1089). The earliest manuscript containing the division of Bishop Langton is the Paris manuscript of the Vulgate from the thirteenth century. From the Vulgate, this division was transferred to the manuscripts and editions of the Hebrew Bible. See J.H.A. van Banning, S.J., “Reflections upon the Chapter Divisions of Stephan Langton,” in *Method in Unit Delimitation* (ed. M.J. Korpel et al.; Pericope 6; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007), 141–161.

2 R.L. Omanson & P.A. Noss, *A Handbook on the Book of Esther, The Hebrew and Greek Texts* (UBS Handbook Series, New York: American Bible Society, 1997).

TABLE 1 *Meaningful units in Esther according to Omanson–Noss*

Chapters	Omanson–Noss
1	Vashti's disobedience and the result
2	Esther becomes queen
3	Mordecai brings down Haman's anger upon himself and his people
4	Mordecai asks for Esther's help
5:1–8	Esther's first banquet invitation
5:9–14	Haman plots to kill Mordecai
6:1–13	Mordecai is honored; Haman is humiliated
6:14–7:10	Esther's second banquet invitation
8:1–2	The king promotes Mordecai
8:3–17	Esther and Mordecai arrange for the Jews to be saved
9:1–10	The first victory of the Jews over their enemies
9:11–19	The second victory of the Jews over their enemies
9:20–28	Mordecai established the festival of Purim
9:29–32	Esther's regulation for the festival of Purim
10:1–3	The greatness of Xerxes and Mordecai.

6 (6:14 “While they were still speaking with him, the king’s eunuchs arrived and hurriedly brought Haman to the banquet which Esther had prepared.”) to the next chapter, so that their “chapter 7” starts with 6:14. What is at stake is whether the hurried bringing of Haman to the banquet in this verse was meant to heighten the tension and the suspense as a continuation of the last episode of chapter 6 describing Haman’s chances to overcome Mordecai, or whether this verse is meant to introduce the story of chapter 7. In a way, this verse serves both purposes, and the continuous text, as in the manuscripts, best represents the story as intended by the author. The first verse of chapter 7 (“So the king and Haman came to feast with Queen Esther.”) is based on 6:14, so that the suggestion of Omanson–Noss may be preferable to the chapter division. On the other hand, the pronominal suffix in the phrase “While *they* were still speaking with him” (beginning of 6:14), should not be detached from the persons to whom the phrase referred to in the preceding verses in chapter 6. In that case the traditional chapter division should be preferred to the perception of Omanson–Noss based on the *NAB* and *TEV*.³ In short, there is no clear-cut solution regarding the dividing line between chapters 6 and 7 (see further below).

3 *NAB*; *Good News Bible, The Bible in Today's English Version* (New York: American Bible Society,

TABLE 2 *The content of the chapters of Esther according to Omanson–Noss*

Chapters	Omanson–Noss
1	Vashti’s disobedience and the result
2	Esther becomes queen
3	Mordecai brings down Haman’s anger upon himself and his people
4	Mordecai asks for Esther’s help
5	Esther’s first banquet invitation; Haman plots to kill Mordecai
6	Mordecai is honored; Haman is humiliated
7	Esther’s second banquet invitation
8	The king promotes Mordecai; Esther and Mordecai arrange for the Jews to be saved
9	The victories of the Jews over their enemies; the establishment of the festival of Purim
10	The greatness of Xerxes and Mordecai.

2 Section Divisions

It is unknown what the section division in the ancient Hebrew sources of Esther looked like. Judging from parallels with the other Scripture books, we assume that the medieval system of subdividing Esther into a hierarchy of text division already existed in antiquity, but that the various sources differed among themselves in details.

The system of indicating sections is ancient.⁴ Indeed, in the great majority of biblical and nonbiblical texts from the Judean Desert, as in most Greek texts from the Hellenistic period, and in earlier Aramaic texts from the fifth and fourth centuries BCE, the text was subdivided into meaningful units that were separated from one another by means of spacing. Prior to the discovery of the Qumran texts, this system was often wrongly considered to be characteristic of the transmission of MT, where the sections thus indicated were named *parashiyot*.⁵

1978). In both translations, the heading above v. 14 (*TEV*: “Haman is put to death”; *NAB*: “Esther’s second banquet”) and the layout reveal their exegesis.

4 See *Scribal Practices*, 133–166.

5 L. Blau, *Papyri und Talmud in gegenseitiger Beleuchtung* (Leipzig: Gesellschaft zur Förderung

It is not easy to reduce the manifold scribal practices to a small number of systems pertaining to all the texts, since each scribe was to some extent individualistic in denoting sense units; nevertheless two major systems can be discerned in the Judean Desert texts. In these texts, the content is divided into small and larger units. A certain hierarchical relation between these two systems may often be assumed; that is, according to the modern way of thinking we would probably say that larger sense units are often subdivided into smaller units.

To a great extent, the division into section units by scribes was impressionistic. It appears that scribal decisions on the type of relation between section units were often, but not always, decided *ad hoc*, made upon completion of the copying of one unit and before embarking on the next. To some extent, this procedure explains the differences between manuscripts of the same composition, as scribes often approached the relation between two units differently. Furthermore, after the initial paragraph division of Esther was determined, each scribe made changes in accord with the dimensions of the new scroll if it differed from an earlier one.

No rule exists in ancient or medieval texts regarding the length of a section that is separated from the preceding and following section units. This parameter depends on the nature of the literary composition and on the scribe's understanding. The two extremes are evidenced: some manuscripts have many section divisions, while others have virtually none. Thus the book of Ruth in MT contains only one section division, after 4:17. Other divisions are called for, but they were not included in MT.

The following two main systems are recognized in ancient texts written in the paleo-Hebrew and square scripts:

(a) A space in the middle of the line ("closed section" in the Masoretic tradition recorded below as "S[etumah]") usually denotes a segmentation of a larger unit (such as described in *b*) into one or more smaller units:

xx xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
xx

In principle, a closed section is thematically related to the immediately preceding section, if any, but the vagueness of this definition leads to differences of

der Wissenschaft des Judentums, 1913), 15 was probably the first to assume the widespread use of such divisions in all texts long before the discovery of the Qumran scrolls.

opinion with regard to the interpretation of this relation. If this thematic relation was not recognized, scribes usually denoted the new section as an “open section.”

(b) A space extending from the last word in the line to the end of the line indicates a *major* division (an “open section” in the Masoretic tradition recorded below as “P[etuhah]”).

```

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
                xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

```

In most scrolls, this system reflects the largest degree of separation between sections. In ancient scrolls and medieval manuscripts two additional systems are used, indentation and completely empty lines. These are not used in medieval Esther scrolls.

The indication of a section division is very subjective, whether inserted by the first or subsequent copyists. If the initial authors or scribes embedded a hierarchical subdivision in the text, that division necessarily reflected their exegesis, and later scribes often changed this understanding, sometimes in a minor way, and sometimes in a major way.

Leaving aside the question of who first inserted the large sense divisions (the initial authors/scribes or subsequent scribes), it is important to know when and why such divisions were indicated in the text. Since these divisions are subjective, there are no *a priori* rules for them.⁶

Within this framework of impressionistic subdivisions we list the data concerning the segmentation of the book of Esther in three manuscripts, three editions, and two commentaries (12 columns of data). The first manuscript, L, is presented differently in three editions according to the editors' conceptions. Only a few sources have been sampled,⁷ as our main purpose is to present the exegetical aspects of the different systems.

6 The logic of the section divisions in one source (1QIsa^a) was analyzed in detail by O.H. Steck, *Die erste Jesajarolle von Qumran (1QIsa^a): Schreibweise als Leseanleitung für ein Prophetenbuch* (SBS 173/1; Stuttgart, 1998). Likewise, the MT of the Torah was examined by C. Perrot, “*Petuhot et setumot*. Étude sur les alinéas du Pentateuque,” *RB* 76 (1969): 50–91 and F. Langlamet, “Les divisions massorétiques du livre de Samuel: À propos de la publication du codex du Caïre,” *RB* 91 (1984): 481–519.

7 A very wide sampling of manuscripts with a typology of their distribution is presented in a forthcoming study by J. Penkower.

1. Reference referring to the section preceding the verse number mentioned.
2. *BHS*⁸ = L.
3. *BHQ*⁹ = L.
4. Adi edition¹⁰ = "L". This edition presents the text of L, but in the sense divisions it provides a form of the traditional division.
5. MS Cambridge University Add. Ms. 1753.¹¹
6. MS EBR. II B 34 of the Russian National Library, St. Petersburg.
7. *BH*, third edition.¹²
8. Rabbinic Bible, second edition (RB2).¹³
9. Edition of C.D. Ginsburg.¹⁴
10. Commentary of G. Gerleman: layout of the German translation.¹⁵
11. Commentary of A. Berlin: layout of the text and translation.¹⁶
Both commentators added several sense divisions in the presentation of the Hebrew text. Added sections against the evidence of manuscripts and editions are indicated as "[P]" or "[s/P]".¹⁷
12. Contents of chapters and sections according to Omanson–Noss.

8 *BHS* (1967–1977).

9 *BHQ*. The details of the sense division of L are recorded in the third column in the Table in *BHQ*, part 18, p. 21*.

10 A. Dotan, *תורה נביאים וכתובים מדויקים היטב על פי הניקוד הטעמים והמסורה של אהרן בן משה בן אשר*, (Tel Aviv: Adi, 1976). בכתיב יד לניגוד.

11 This and the following manuscripts are quoted according to *BHQ*, p. 21*.

12 *Biblia Hebraica* (3rd ed.; ed. R. Kittel & P. Kahle; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1929–1937).

13 Ed. Jacob Ben-Hayyim ben Adoniyahu (Venice: Daniel Bomberg, 1524–1525) = RB2. The details were recorded according to a later printing (Jerusalem: Levin-Epstein, n.d.).

14 C.D. Ginsburg, *תורה נביאים וכתובים מדויק היטב על פי המסרה ועל פי דפוסים ראשונים* (London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1926).

15 G. Gerleman, *Esther* (BKAT; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973).

16 A. Berlin, *The JPS Bible Commentary, Esther* (Philadelphia: JPS, 2001). The layout of the biblical text included in the Hebrew translation of the commentary is imprecise and does not reflect the finesses of the author's intentions: *Esther, Introduction and Commentary* (Heb.; *Mikra Leyisra'el*, A Bible Commentary for Israel; Tel Aviv/Jerusalem: Am Oved/Magnes, 2001).

17 The space left until the end of the line in the printed text resembles an open section (P), but I have the impression that the commentators often meant a closed section (S). I therefore indicated these section divisions as s/P.

TABLE 3 *Meaningful units in Esther recorded according to different sources*

Manuscripts				Editions			Commentaries				
Reference (before verse)	BHS = L	BHQ = L	Adi = "L"	MS 1753	MS 34	BH	RB2	Ginsburg ¹⁸	Gerleman ¹⁹	Berlin	Content of chapters and sections ²⁰
Ch. 1											Wine and women <i>Vashti's disobedience and the result</i>
1:1											Ahasuerus's feast
1:9	—	—	S (L: —)	—	>	—	S	S	—	[P]	Vashti's feast
1:10	S	S	— (L: S)	S	>	S	—	—	S/P	S	Vashti refuses to come
1:13	—	—	S (L: —)	S	>	—	S	S	—	[S/P]	The king takes advice what to do

18 The edition of Ginsburg denotes only closed sections, as found in some manuscripts and many printed editions. See G.H. Cohen, *Introduction to Five Megillot, Esther* (Hebr.; Jerusalem: Rav Kook Institute, 1973), 3.

19 Gerleman makes no distinction between s and p, all presented with indentations.

20 This column, referring to both paragraphs and chapters, repeats the description provided in Tables 1 and 2.

Reference (before verse)	BHS = L	BHQ = L	Adi = "L"	MS 1753	MS 34	BH	RB2	Ginsburg	Gerleman	Berlin	Content of chapters and sections
1:16	S	S	S	P	>	S	S	S	—	S	Memukhan's advice (16–22)
1:19	—	—	—	—	>	—	—	—	—	[S/P]	
1:21	—	—	—	—	>	—	—	—	—	[S/P]	
Ch. 2											
											Sex and spies
											<i>Esther becomes queen</i>
2:1	P	P	S	P	P	P	S	S	P	P	Search for a queen
			(L; P)								
2:5	S	S	S	P	P	S	S	S	S/P	S	Esther is chosen as queen (5–20)
2:8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	[S/P]	
2:12	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	[S/P]	[S/P]	
2:15	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	[S/P]	—	

Reference (before verse)	BHS = L	BHQ = L	Adi = "L"	MS 1753	MS 34	BH	RB2	Ginsburg	Gedeman	Berlin	Content of chapters and sections
3:12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	[P]	[S/P]	
3:15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	[S/P]	
Ch. 4											
4:1	P	P	S	S	P	P	S	S	P	P	Mord. asks for Esther's help
4:4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	[S/P]	-	
4:7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	[S/P]	-	
4:10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	[S/P]	-	
4:12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	[S/P]	
4:13	P	P	-	P	P	P	-	-	-	P	Continued conversation, fasting of the Jews

TABLE 3 *Meaningful units in Esther recorded according to different sources (cont.)*

Reference (before verse)	BHS = L	BHQ = L	Adi = "L"	MS 1753	MS 34	BH	RB2	Ginsburg	Gedeman	Berlin	Content of chapters and sections
<i>Ch. 5</i>											
										Party favors	<i>Esther's first banquet invitation; H plots to kill Mord.</i>
5:1	P (L: S)	S	- (L: S)	S	S	P	-	-	P	S	Esther approaches the king
5:3	S	S	- (L: S)	-	S	S	-	-	-	S	Esther request to the king at the first meal (3-8)
5:6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	[S/P]	
5:9	P (L: -)	-	-	-	-	P	-	-	[P]	[S/P]	Haman prepares gal- lows for Mordecai
<i>Ch. 6</i>											
										Honor gained and lost	<i>Mordecai is honored; Haman is humiliated</i>
6:1	P	P	S (L: P)	S	P	P	S	S	P	P	The king rewards Mord., H, prepares the horse (1-13)

Reference (before verse)	BHS = L	BHQ = L	Adi = "L"	MS 1753	MS 34	BH	RB2	Ginsburg	Gedeman	Berlin	Content of chapters and sections
6:11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	[s/p]	-	
6:12	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	[s/p]	
6:14	P (L: -)	-	-	-	-	P	-	-	[p]	[s/p]	Haman is rushed to Esther's dinner
Ch. 7										Another party favor	Esther's second banquet invitation
7:1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Esther's request to save the Jews
7:5	s	s	s	s	s	s	s	s	-	s	The king consents
7:9	s	s	- (L: s)	s	s	-	-	-	-	s	Haman is hanged on the gallows

TABLE 3 *Meaningful units in Esther recorded according to different sources (cont.)*

Reference (before verse)	BHS = L	BHQ = L	Adi = "L"	MS 1753	MS 34	BH	RB2	Ginsburg	Gedeman	Berlin	Content of chapters and sections
Ch. 8											
8:1	S (L: P)	S (L: P)	S (L: P)	P	P	S	S	S	S	P	A reversal of fortunes The king promotes Mord.; Esther and Mord. arrange for the Jews to be saved
8:3	P	S (L: P)	S (L: P)	S	P	P	S	S	P	P	Esther receives Haman's property Esther asks the king to reverse H's decree
8:7	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	—	S	The king sends a new edict (7–14)
8:9	—	—	—	—	>	—	—	—	[s/p]	[s/p]	
8:11	—	—	—	—	>	—	—	—	[s/p]	—	
8:13	—	—	—	—	>	—	—	—	[s/p]	—	
8:15	P	S (L: P)	S (L: P)	S	>	S	S	S	s/p	P	Mord. is being honored

Reference (before verse)	BHS = L	BHQ = L	Adi = "L"	MS 1753	MS 34	BH	RB2	Ginsburg	Gedeman	Berlin	Content of chapters and sections
Ch. 9											<i>Victories of the Jews over enemies; establishment of Purim</i>
9:1	P (L: -)	-	-	-	>	P	-	-	[P]	- printed as P	13 Adar
9:5	S (L: P)	P	- (L: P)	-	>	S	-	-	S/P	P printed continuously	Vengeance by the Jews (5-10)
9:6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	[S/P]	
9:10	-	-	-	S	>	-	-	-	-	-	
9:11	P (L: -)	-	-	-	>	P	-	-	[S/P]	-	The king suggests a 2nd day of killing in the king's provinces (11-19)

TABLE 3 *Meaningful units in Esther recorded according to different sources*

Reference (before verse)	Manuscripts				Editions				Commentaries		Content of chapters and sections
	<i>BHS</i> = L	<i>BHQ</i> = L	Adi = "L"	MS 1753	MS 34	<i>BH</i>	RB2	Ginsburg	Gerleman	Berlin	
9:12	S	S	—	—	>	S	—	—	—	S printed continuously	
9:16	S (L: —)	—	—	—	—	S	—	—	[S/P]	[S/P]	
9:20	P	P	— (L: P)	S	P	P	—	—	P	P	Mord. writes a letter instituting the holiday (20–28)
9:23	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	[S/P]	—	
9:24	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	[S/P]	
9:29	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S/P	S	Esther ratifies holiday
<i>Ch. 10</i>										All's well that ends well	<i>The greatness of Xerxes and Mordecai</i>
10:1	P	P	S (L: P)	S	P	P	S	S	P	P	Moral of the story

3 Relation between Chapter and Section Divisions

It was expected that the medieval chapter division would coincide with P section divisions in the Jewish tradition, since P is a large form of interval. However, the two systems derive from different sources, so that they sometimes differ in accord with their own internal logic. In most chapters the chapter division indeed coincides with open sections, but not so in four chapters of Esther,²¹ reflecting a rather high percentage for its ten chapters.

3.1 *Transition from Chapter 4 to 5*

(S in L; MS Cambridge University Add. Ms. 1753; MS EBR. II B 34 of the Russian National Library, St. Petersburg). The tradition of the printed Bibles (RB2, Ginsburg) takes chapters 4 and 5 as one large uninterrupted unit without a major division (P) at the beginning of chapter 5.²² There is much to be said in favor of the traditional approach since chapters 4–5 of MT indeed form one long narrative unit from the point of view of content. Chapter 4 contains Mordecai's request for help from Esther continued in chapter 5 by Esther's first banquet invitation; in the same unit, Haman plots to kill Mordecai. To some extent, this arrangement is thus better than the artificial creation of two chapters in the chapter division.

3.2 *Transition from Chapter 6 to 7*

All sources take chapters 6 and 7 as one large unit, uninterrupted in 7:1. From the point of view of content such a unit is indeed preferable to the chapter division, since in that division chapter 7 constitutes a short chapter (10 verses). In chapter 6 Mordecai is honored and Haman is humiliated. As a logical continuation chapter 7 contains Esther's request from the king to save the Jews, and as a result Haman is hanged on the gallows. There is much to be said in favor of this division since the combined chapter 6–7 would contain the central action of reversal in the book. The story in chapter 6–7 is dynamic and the main events happen within this central unit. Further, neither the manuscripts nor the editions record any division at 7:1. On the other hand, BH and BHS start a new unit ("chapter 7," so to speak) one verse before 7:1, at 6:14, against all the evidence, with an open section, and so do the commentaries of Gerleman and Berlin (see above). Also in this case the artificial chapter division goes against the manuscript evidence.

21 There are S divisions in codex L before chapters 5 and 8, and no section division at all before chapters 7 and 9.

22 See below regarding the P division in 4:13 reflecting an unusual choice by a scribe.

3.3 *Transition from Chapter 8 to 9*

The medieval chapter division that starts a new chapter at 9:1 goes against the manuscript evidence. At the same time, the Jewish tradition does not make 8–9 one long chapter, but it divides the content differently. The stories in chapter 8 are subdivided with several open divisions (P):

8:1–2 Esther receives Haman's property.

8:3–14 Esther asks the king to reverse Haman's decree; the king sends a new edict.

8:15–9:4 Mordecai is being honored; background description of 13 Adar.

9:5–19 Vengeance by the Jews. The king suggests a second day of killing in the king's provinces.

9:20–32: Mordecai writes a letter instituting the holiday; Esther ratifies the holiday.

In conclusion: in chapters 4–5 and 6–7 the creation of two chapters each in the chapter division is artificial.²³ In chapters 8–9 the chapter division at 9:1 is an alternative to a different type of division in the Jewish tradition, in smaller units.²⁴ In all three cases the chapter division goes against the section division, but not against the unit division, since the Jewish tradition did not include units greater than sections.

4 Manuscripts, Editions, and Commentaries

4.1 *Manuscripts and Editions*

Very few manuscripts have been selected for this study. See n. 7. The section divisions in codex L have been recorded in three different editions. The imprecise recording of L in *BHS* has been corrected in *BHQ*. The divisions in the *Adi* edition, that otherwise reflects L, do not reflect L.²⁵

²³ In other instances the decisions made by bishop Stephen Langton were more flawed. See Tov, *TCHB*, 52–53; J.S. Penkower, “The Chapter Division in the 1525 Rabbinic Bible,” *VT* 48 (1998): 350–374.

²⁴ The alternative major division point is probably at 8:15.

²⁵ A. Dotan was responsible for this aspect in *BHQ* as well as in the *Adi* edition. The practice of the *Adi* edition is explained on p. 1110.

4.2 *Commentaries*

As a rule, the commentaries divide the text into a larger number of major units than the ten traditional chapters. Omanson-Noss (Tables 1 and 2 above) divide the text into fifteen such units, Berlin into 11,²⁶ and Gerleman into 13 major units,²⁷ some of them consisting of a few verses only. Had these commentators been asked to propose a new subject division of the book, they would probably have proposed their own division instead of the traditional one.

The differences between the traditional divisions (chapters and sections) and the divisions of each of the commentaries show the subjectivity of each system. A good example of this feature is the section division of Berlin in her commentary published in a traditional Jewish commentary series. Realizing the subjectivity of the earlier systems, this commentator allowed herself to disregard in the layout of the translation several traditional section notations (3:8 S; 4:13 S;²⁸ 5:3 S; 7:9 S; 9:5 P; 9:12 S) and to add new ones (1:13, 19, 21; 2:8, 12, 16, 19; 3:7, 12, 15; 4:12; 5:6, 9; 6:12, 14; 9:1, 6, 16). Likewise, Gerleman disregarded section divisions (1:13, 16; 3:8; 4:13; 5:3; 7:5, 9; 8:7) and added several new ones (2:12, 15, 16, 19; 3:12; 4:4, 7, 10; 5:9; 6:11, 14; 8:9, 11, 13; 9:1, 11, 16, 23).

Above, we pointed to some of the difficulties in the chapter divisions. Some examples follow for the section divisions.

1:9 describes a feast that Vashti organized. This is a one-verse description of Vashti's feast about which no information is given. The description in this verse sets the stage for the invitation of Vashti by Ahasuerus in the next verse, 10. Since v. 9 stands by its own it could be connected with the preceding verses 1–8 as in codex L and the other sources. According to that understanding, the banquets of Ahasuerus and Vashti constitute one unit. However, the verse could also be understood as beginning a new section with 1:9, as in RB2, Ginsburg, and Adi. Both types of division are possible. Berlin follows RB2, while Gerleman follows codex L.

2:21–23 (the plot to kill the king) forms a major independent section in Gerleman's commentary, introduced by a P, while it is introduced by an S in all other sources. These verses could be combined with the earlier verses as a separate episode like in the chapter division and the traditional Jewish understanding

26 1:1,9; 2:1; 3:1; 4:1; 5:1; 6:1; 7:1; 8:1; 9:1; 10:1.

27 1:1–22; 2:1–20; 2:21–23; 3:1–15; 4:1–17; 5:1–8; 5:9–14; 6:1–13; 6:14–8:2; 8:3–17; 9:1–19; 9:20–32; 10:1–3.

28 The division in 4:12 is disregarded, while a new one is added in 4:13.

(preceded by s). This understanding is also implied by the next verse (אחר הדברים האלה) clearly starting a major unit (3:1).

4:13 The P division found in several sources²⁹ is problematical. Chapter 4 contains a long conversation between Mordecai and Esther, and accordingly a major section division before 4:13 in the middle of that conversation seems to be out of place. The maximum expected division would be an s. This division is rightly disregarded in Berlin's commentary.

5:9 The presentation of a P in the middle of chapter 5 before 5:9³⁰ is more than is called for at this point in the story. It comes after Esther's request to the king at the first meal, and before Haman's preparation of gallows for Mordecai. According to the dynamics of the story there should be no division at this point or at most an s division.

Chapter 6. The story in this chapter could have been suspended by one or two s intervals, while the whole chapter is now presented in most sources as one uninterrupted long story. Probably this lack of intervals reflects the literary understanding of haste expressed by the continuous sequence of events. See, further, above on 6:14.

7:1-4 and 7:5-8 are two episodes in a conversation between Esther and the king, separated by an s division. Elsewhere, for example in chapter 4, there is no such separation between the sections after each stage in the conversation between Esther and Mordecai.

5 Conclusions

The analysis showed the different logic behind the chapter and section divisions. All these divisions are subjective in the ancient and medieval manuscripts, chapter division, and modern commentaries. In the case of the section divisions, they reflect the exegesis of one or more scribes. In both cases not all section divisions reflect the dynamics of the story itself.

29 L; MS Cambridge University Add. Ms. 1753; MS EBR. II B 34 of the Russian National Library, St. Petersburg; BH.

30 BH, BHS, Gerleman, Berlin. All other sources have no division.

Eclectic Text Editions of Hebrew Scripture

1 Logic of Eclectic Editions

In the course of the critical investigation of the Hebrew Bible, it is often felt that the combination of a diplomatically presented base text (codex L or A) and a critical apparatus do not suffice for the efficient use of the textual data. Consultation of MT alone is considered unsatisfactory since it is merely one of many biblical texts. By the same token, the use of an apparatus is cumbersome as it involves a complicated mental exercise. The apparatus makes it necessary for the user to place the variants, which in his/her mind may replace readings of MT, in imaginary (virtual) boxes. Since each scholar evaluates the data differently, everyone mentally creates a different reconstructed *Urtext*. In other words, the user of the *BH* series constantly works with two sets of data, a real edition (MT) that lies before him/her and a virtual one, composed eclectically from the apparatus.¹

Against this background, it is not surprising that a system has been devised to transform the fragmented and often confusing information of a critical apparatus into a new and stable type of tool, named an “eclectic” or “critical” edition.² It is no longer necessary to replace in one’s mind a detail of MT with a variant reading found in the apparatus, as these preferred readings are now incorporated into the running text. An edition of this type provides a very convenient way of using the textual data together with an expert’s evaluation. This procedure is common in classical studies (see the many editions of Greek and Latin classical texts published by Oxford University Press and Teubner of Leipzig),³ and also has much to recommend it for the study of Hebrew

-
- 1 The user of the *HUB* does not create his/her own virtual edition, since that edition does not evaluate the readings, as does the *BH* series, leaving the decision process to the user. This neutral presentation probably is profitable for those who prefer to evaluate the readings themselves during the course of writing commentaries or studies, but many users would prefer to have the data provided together with a value judgment by an expert in textual criticism.
 - 2 The term “critical edition” is probably misleading for this type of edition at the present stage of research, since the *BH* series also provides critical editions. The earlier edition of Haupt (see n. 5) was also named “critical” (“a critical edition of the Hebrew text printed in colors ...”), but that edition appeared before the *BH* series.
 - 3 See the instructive study of M.L. West, “The Textual Criticism and Editing of Homer,” in *Editing*

Scripture. Besides, the best editions of the Septuagint are also eclectic, and very few scholars would contest the wisdom of the system used by the *Göttingen Septuaginta Unternehmen* in producing their magnificent editions. If it works for the Septuagint, why would it not work for Scripture as a whole? Indeed, some of the best textual critics were involved in such enterprises in the past and are also involved in present projects.

2 Old and New in Eclectic Editions

I do not know when the first eclectic edition of Hebrew Scripture or part thereof was produced; I can trace these editions back to Cornill's edition of Ezekiel produced in 1886.⁴ This edition is based on sound, mature scholarship and therefore it would be hard to imagine that earlier editions did not precede it. We should, of course, remember that this edition was preceded by several eclectic translations included in scholarly commentaries that must have influenced the production of similar editions in Hebrew. Important eclectic editions of the Biblical books were produced in the following decennia under the editorship of P. Haupt in an impressive series.⁵ C.H. Cornill, B. Stade and other eminent scholars participated in this series. These editions influenced scholarship to some extent, and shortly thereafter a different type of critical edition was created, viz., the first editions in the *BH* series in which the critical notes were included in the apparatus and not in the text.⁶ From 1900 onwards, we witness a series of eclectic editions of parts of books, often of parallel sources, such as Psalms 14//53.⁷ The creation of eclectic editions continued in modern times, especially in Italian scholarship.⁸ The production of these editions has been institutionalized, since plans for a complete eclectic Scripture edition are now

Texts: Texte edieren (Aporemata, Kritische Studien zur Philologiegeschichte 2; ed. G.M. Most; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 94–110.

4 C.H. Cornill, *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1886).

5 *The Sacred Books of the Old Testament, A Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text, Printed in Colors, with Notes* (ed. P. Haupt; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrich, 1893–1904).

6 First and second editions: Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1905, 1913, ed. R. Kittel.

7 For a list of such editions, see my *TCHB*, 372, n. 2.

8 P.G. Borbone, *Il libro del Profeta Osea, Edizione critica del testo ebraico* (Quaderni di Henoch 2; Torino: Zamorani, [1990]); G. Garbini, *Cantico dei Cantici: Testo, tradizione, note e commento* (Brescia: Paideia, 1992), 142–167; A. Catastini, *Storia di Giuseppe (Genesi 37–50)* (Venice: Marsilio, 1994); this study needs to be viewed together with Catastini's detailed textual analysis, *L'itinerario di Giuseppe, Studio sulla tradizione di Genesi 37–50* (Dipartimento di Studi Orientali. Studi Semitici, N. S. 13; Roma: Università degli Studi "La Sapienza," 1995); Hendel, *Genesis*

under way. The so-called *HBCE* (*The Hebrew Bible, A Critical Edition*; previously: *OHB* = *Oxford Hebrew Bible*) is scheduled to present biblical scholars with an eclectic edition of all the Scripture books that will enable scholars to use an edition that incorporates the fruits of textual scholarship not in an apparatus, but in the text itself.

The system of *HBCE* is presented in a lucid programmatic introduction by its editor-in-chief, R. Hendel.⁹ That system does not differ much from the earlier eclectic editions, but a comparison with these older editions is not of central importance for the new project.¹⁰ The *HBCE* presents critically restored texts accompanied by an apparatus of readings that differ from the main text and a series of textual notes defending the decisions. The readings of MT are often included in the apparatus when the editor preferred a reading of a Qumran scroll, LXX, or another source.¹¹

3 Theoretical Foundations of Eclectic Editions

The older eclectic editions provided very little theoretical background for the procedure followed. It was supposed to be self-evident that scholars may compose their own editions following a longstanding tradition for such editions in classical scholarship and the study of the NT. On the other hand, Hendel

1–11; K. Hognesius, *The Text of 2 Chronicles 1–16, A Critical Edition with Textual Commentary* (ConBOT 51; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2003); cf. my review of the latter in *SEÁ* 68 (2003): 208–213.

9 “The Oxford Hebrew Bible; Prologue to a New Critical Edition,” *VT* 58 (2008): 324–351. See also idem, “A New Edition of the Hebrew Bible,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Vol. One, Scripture and the Scrolls* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2006), 149–165.

10 Haupt’s edition is mentioned in Hendel, *Prologue*, 335, but not the other ones referred to in notes 7 and 8.

11 The following samples have been published so far: H.F. Van Rooy, “A New Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible,” *JNSL* 30 (2004): 139–150 (Ezekiel 1); S.W. Crawford, “Textual Criticism of the Book of Deuteronomy and the *Oxford Hebrew Bible* Project,” in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients. Essays Offered to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. R.L. Troxel et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 315–326; M.V. Fox, “Editing Proverbs: The Challenge of the *Oxford Hebrew Bible*,” *JNSL* 32 (2006): 1–22; R. Hendel, “Plural Texts and Literary Criticism: For Instance, 1 Samuel 17,” *Textus* 23 (2007): 97–114; S.W. Crawford, J. Joosten, and E. Ulrich, “Sample Editions of the Oxford Hebrew Bible: Deuteronomy 32:1–9, 1 Kings 11:1–8, and Jeremiah 27:1–10 (34 G),” *VT* 58 (2008): 352–366.

presents at length the theoretical background of the eclectic procedure that justifies the recording of the preferred readings in the text rather than an apparatus, as in the *BH* series. The difference between the two systems is significant, since most scholars are used to the apparatus of the *BH* series. The system of the planned editions is not innovative when compared with the editions of the beginning of the twentieth century, although they present new material, such as the valuable Dead Sea Scrolls, and are more advanced and thorough. Further, Hendel is probably correct in stating that the procedure followed is not necessarily in disagreement with that of the *BH* series; in the words of Hendel, “[t]he *BHQ* and *OHB* [= *HBCE*] are complementary rather than contradictory projects.”¹²

The goals of the eclectic editions were phrased best by Hendel in constant dialogue with other scholars. “The practical goal for the *OHB* [= *BHCE*] is to approximate in its critical text the textual ‘archetype,’ by which I mean,” says Hendel,¹³ “the earliest inferable textual state.” He further cautions:¹⁴

The theory of an eclectic edition assumes that approximating the archetype is a step towards the “original text,” however that original is to be conceived. (...) In the case of the Hebrew Bible it is difficult to define what the “original” means, since each book is the product of a complicated and often unrecoverable history of composition and redaction. The “original text” that lies somewhere behind the archetype is usually not the product of a single author, but a collective production, sometimes constructed over centuries, perhaps comparable to the construction of a medieval cathedral or the composite walls of an old city.

It is a sign of good scholarship that Hendel constantly struggles with the question of the original text, as seen also in the continued analysis, in which he discusses my views. The same difficulties are recognized by Hognesius:¹⁵

¹² Hendel, “Prologue,” 337.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 329–330. For this statement, Hendel refers to E.J. Kenney, “Textual Criticism,” *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (15th ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 18.191. On the other hand, the guiding principle of the edition of Fox, “Editing Proverbs,” 7, within the same *HBCE* project, aims at “the correct hyparchetype of the Masoretic Proverbs, that is to say, the proto-Masoretic text.” I do not know whether the following statement by Fox, *ibid.*, 7 is compatible with Hendel’s formulations: “Hence the text I am aiming at *never had physical existence*. It is a construct. It can be defined as the proto-MT *as it should have been* [emphasis M.V. Fox] ...”

¹⁴ Hendel, “Prologue,” 332.

¹⁵ Hognesius, *Chronicles*, 28–29.

It is not the intention of the present author to claim that this edition presents *the* text of 2 Chronicles 1–16, but, rather, that it attempts to make a contribution to serious scholarly discussion on text-critical matters. If eventually, such serious discussion would lead to the publishing of critical editions of the text of the Old Testament, this would be for the benefit of all Old Testament scholars.

In spite of the problems encountered, the editors of the *HBCE* believe that there *was* an original text (or in some cases two), since otherwise they would not have reconstructed such an entity. However, now more than ever it seems to me that there never was an “archetype” or “original text” of most Scripture books.¹⁶ For most biblical books, scholars assume editorial changes over the course of many generations or even several centuries. If this assumption is correct, this development implies that there never was a single text that may be considered *the* original text for textual criticism; rather, we have to assume compositional stages, each of which was meant to be authoritative when completed. Each stage constituted an entity that may be named an “original text.” These compositional stages did not always take the form of a completely new edition of the whole book, but may have involved the change of what is now a single chapter or an even smaller unit. In the wake of earlier studies,¹⁷ we ought to ask ourselves which stage, if any, may be presented as original or archetypal in a modern edition.

The point of departure for the *HBCE* is the assumption that there was one or, in some cases, two such editions that may be reconstructed. The *BH* series, and *BHQ* in particular, struggles with the same problems,¹⁸ but in that enterprise there are fewer difficulties since the edition itself always presents MT. In its apparatus, the *BH* series presents elements as original or archetypal, but it can always allow itself the luxury of not commenting on all the readings recorded, while the *HBCE* has to make decisions in all instances.

If the principle of reconstructing an original edition based on evidence and emendation is accepted, it remains difficult to decide which compositional level should be reconstructed. In other words, what is the scope of the changes

16 True, the composition and transmission history of some units in Scripture was simpler than that of others. For example, in many individual Psalms, the textual evidence is probably very close to that of the poems created by the ancient poets, that is, they attest to a stage rather close to the original text. Equally important is the assumption that in these cases an original text existed that was created by the poet and usually not changed by later editors.

17 See my analyses in *HB*, *GB*, and *Qumran*, 155–170, 206–220.

18 Several large or small deviations from MT are indicated in the apparatus as “lit(erary).”

that may be inserted in MT? Small changes are definitely permissible, but why should one stop at verses? An editor of the *HBCE* may also decide to exclude the secondarily added hymns of Hannah (1 Sam 2:1–10) and Jonah (Jonah 2). If most scholars agree that these psalms are secondary, I see no reason why an editor of *HBCE* should not exclude them. I am only using this example to illustrate the problems involved; I do not think that an *HBCE* editor would actually exclude these chapters (although, according to the internal logic of the *HBCE*, they should, I think). However, I can imagine that someone would exclude Gen 12:6 “And the Canaanites were then in the land,” considered secondary by all critical scholars.

In short, innumerable difficulties present themselves in places where complex literary development took place. In fact, the evaluation of the two editions of Jeremiah (see below) seems to be a simple case in comparison with the very complex compositional and transmissional stages visible in other units.

In the words of Hendel, in the case of multiple editions, “[T]he practical goal for the OHB [= *HBCE*] is to approximate in its critical text the textual ‘archetype,’ by which I mean the ‘earliest inferable textual state.’ In the case of multiple editions the practical goal is to approximate the archetype of each edition, and where one edition is not plausibly the ancestor of the other[s], also the archetype of the multiple editions.”¹⁹ This is an important step forward, but the problems in the details of the published reconstructions of these parallel editions (1 Kings 11 MT and LXX, Jeremiah 27 MT and LXX,²⁰ and 1 Samuel 17²¹) are so complex that the above description may be considered naive. The problems mentioned above are not diminished, but increased.

4 Principles behind the Eclectic Choice of Readings

The backbone of the textual procedure is the evaluation of readings, that is, an analysis of their comparative merits. The purpose of this procedure has been formulated in different ways. Most scholars assert that their intention is to choose the *original* reading from the relevant data, i.e., the one reading that, although not necessarily the best, was most likely to have been contained in the original text. Others attempt to identify the reading from which all others developed, or from which their existence can be explained. Textual

19 Hendel, “Prologue,” 329–330.

20 For these, see Crawford–Joosten–Ulrich, “Sample Editions.”

21 Hendel, “Plural Texts,” 114 admits that the edition proposed in his paper heralds merely the beginning of a dialogue between scholars.

guidelines have been formulated, but I have pointed out the limitations of such guidelines.²² Whatever we may think of the formulation of the purpose of textual criticism and the validity of the textual guidelines, textual critics continue to compare readings. In this regard, there is no difference between the principles used in the evaluation of readings for the *BH* series and for eclectic editions. Some such principles have been formulated in a rudimentary way for *BHQ*,²³ but they can hardly be activated objectively, because of the differences in outlook among scholars. I have suggested that both external and internal arguments are usually invalid and that the essence of the textual procedure is the subjective evaluation of readings; textual evaluation is an art rather than a science.

If there are no generally accepted rules for textual evaluation, we should not expect the impossible from the editors of eclectic editions. Nevertheless, Borbone provided some rules for his eclectic edition.²⁴ However, these rules are so abstract and general that they are of little practical use for establishing the critical text of Hosea.²⁵ Hendel's own critical edition of Genesis 1–11 likewise did include a discussion of "types of text-critical decisions."²⁶ On the other hand, in his *HBCE* project, Hendel did not provide such rules, possibly rightly so, since there are no workable rules.

As expected, all eclectic editions (including *HBCE*) and the *BH* series are subjective in their textual evaluations. An *HBCE* editor may include a long plus from a Qumran text, and he/she may exclude a whole verse, change the wording, language, and orthography. All these decisions are acceptable within the discipline of textual criticism. Since these choices are the brainchild of an editor, they may be changed in the future by the same scholar following further study or may be contradicted by the majority of scholars. These decisions are as subjective as those reflected in the *BH* series; however, the difference between the two editions is that with *BHS* or *BHQ* in one's hand, one continues to use the transmitted text (MT) with a reconstructed text in one's mind, as recorded in the apparatus. On the other hand, in the case of eclectic editions one *has* to use the reconstructed text, while the transmitted text remains somewhere in one's mind. This mental exercise involves much maneuvering, in my view, because

22 *TCHB*, chapter 6.

23 *BHQ* part 18, LXXXV–XCIV.

24 Borbone, *Osea*, 26–32, 55–59.

25 For example, rules 6 ("*Lectio, quae cum stylo scriptoris convenit, melior est*") and 7 ("*Ea lectio vera et genuina esse nequit, quae nullo modo contextui apta aut consilio scriptoris prorsus contraria est*").

26 Hendel, *Genesis 1–11*, 6–10.

the object of our study is the Bible, imperfect as codex L or any other source may be, and not the brainchild of a given scholar. If we should use an edition that is more daring than others, the basis of our study is even less stable.

5 Difficulties in Reconstructing Details in the Text

While several eclectic editions have been published, only a few editors are aware of the pitfalls of reconstructing the details. Cornill, *Ezechiel*, who offered the first serious reconstruction, was aware of the difficulties in reconstructing the orthography of the original version of that book. He describes the system employed as well as the criticisms voiced against him, and he wisely decided not to include vocalization in his reconstructed original text.²⁷

Likewise, Hendel realized that he could not reconstruct all the details in the reconstructed original text, so he gave up the idea of reconstructing what he calls the “accidentals” (spelling and paragraphing), and focused on “substantive readings”²⁸ of the central text, which for *HBCE* is codex L, which he names the “copy-text.”²⁹ He further notes: “Where the critical text differs from the copy-text in its substantive readings, the critical text will lack the vocalization and accents of the copy-text (but maintaining its orthographic style).”³⁰

The presentation of the orthography of the reconstructed original text poses an almost insurmountable problem. Hendel was aware of this problem, and decided to retain the spelling of codex L, together with its vocalization and accentuation. Words included in the eclectic text that differ from MT are presented without these two sets of data, but the reconstructed *Vorlage* of the LXX in 1 Kings 11, when agreeing with MT, is reconstructed together with the Masoretic vowels and accents.³¹

However, in all other instances *HBCE* leaves the vowels in the text, even in the reconstructed *Vorlage* of the LXX such as in “edition B,” which reflects the Hebrew text reconstructed from the LXX in 1 Kings 11.³² The reconstructed *Vor-*

²⁷ Cornill, *Ezechiel*, 160–164.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 344.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 343. Hendel follows the system of W.W. Greg, see *Sir Walter Wilson Greg: A Collection of His Writings* (ed. J. Rosenblum; Lanham, 1998), 213–228 [*non vidi*].

³⁰ Ibid., p. 345. This aspect was much criticized by H.G.M. Williamson, “Do We Need A New Bible? Reflections on the Proposed Oxford Hebrew Bible,” *Bib* 90 (2009): 153–175.

³¹ On the other hand, Van Rooy, “A New Critical Edition” provides both the unvocalized and the vocalized critical text.

³² See the contribution of Joosten in Crawford–Joosten–Ulrich, “Sample Editions.”

lage of the LXX contains not only the Masoretic vowels but also the cantillation signs (!),³³ so that the reader can now see what the *Vorlage* of the LXX would have looked like with the medieval cantillations. It seems to me that in these two details the system went a little too far.

Hendel realizes that the textual critic cannot in all cases reach a verdict regarding the words to be included in the text. In such cases, especially those of “synonymous readings” recognized by Talmon³⁴ and alternative readings postulated by Goshen-Gottstein,³⁵ the copy-text is left intact, while the apparatus includes another reading considered to be of “equal” value. For example, in 1 Kgs 11:5 for שִׁקָּץ of MT the apparatus records a variant אֶלְהִי reconstructed from the Peshitta and named “equal” by the editor, Joosten.³⁶

6 Textual Commentary

Textual emendation as a system is advisable,³⁷ and the use of details from non-Masoretic Hebrew and translational sources is a *conditio sine qua non* for the praxis of textual criticism. However, it remains problematic whether we will succeed in creating a new edition based on these principles. Above we discussed the problematic aspects of the use of a Bible edition that is based on subjective principles. Accepting for a moment the subjectivity of such an edition, we would at least expect that the reader be given detailed and soundly based reasons for preferring a variant reading to the content of MT. We wonder whether that really is the case in the following instances:

Deut 32:3 גִּדּוּל MT SP is preferred to גִּדּוּל(ה) of 4QDeut^b with the following argument: “גִּדּוּל(ה) in 4QDeut^b is a more common synonym of גִּדָּל; the less common form is preferable.”³⁸ The reader would like to know why it is preferable.

33 Only in words that are identical to MT. In other cases, only the consonants are provided.

34 S. Talmon, “Synonymous Readings in the Textual Traditions of the Old Testament,” *SerHier* 8 (1961): 335–383.

35 M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, “The History of the Bible-Text and Comparative Semitics,” *VT* 7 (1957): 195–201.

36 Joosten in Crawford–Joosten–Ulrich, “Sample Editions,” 359.

37 See *TCHB*, chapter 8 and subsequently, J. Joosten, “Is There a Place for Conjectures in a Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible? Reflections in Preparation of a Critical Edition of 1 Kings,” in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Text in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus* (ed. K. De Troyer et al.; BETL 72; Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 365–375.

38 S.W. Crawford in Crawford–Joosten–Ulrich, “Sample Editions,” 355.

Ezek 1:1 מראות MT is preferred to מראה of “G^L Cat οι λ (ορασιν) Syr Text.”³⁹ The reason given is “assim?” but the reader wonders whether we have any firm criteria for making that choice between the readings.

MT is Corrected

Deut 32:5 “Verse 5 presents a text-critical challenge: its first clause is almost hopelessly corrupt. The reading of each version displays different errors and subsequent attempts to make sense of the result.”⁴⁰ I agree, but I do not think that the correction suggested (שחתו for MT שחת) makes the text much better.

Ezek 1:3 MT היה היה is corrected to a single היה with v (factum est) s T.⁴¹ However, the translations often leave out the second word in this construction, and the presentation of the original text as a single word (MT is presented as “dittog”!) is rather unlikely (יהי would be expected as in 6:1, 7:1, etc.).

Reconstruction of the LXX Column

In Jeremiah 27, *HBCE* does not reconstruct one, but two original texts, “Edition A (≈ G),” and “Edition B (≈ MT).” The reconstruction of the original Hebrew text from the LXX is not easy, especially so if the *HBCE* text of Jeremiah is to be used as the basis for continued scholarship. In the course of the reconstruction of the MT column, ביד מלאכים in v. 3 MT is changed to ביד מלאכיהם probably because the LXX has a suffix (ἐν χερσιν ἁγγέλων αὐτῶν) and possibly because the author⁴² wished to correct the syntax of MT ביד מלאכים הבאים (“... by envoys who have come”). However, the Hebrew relative clause construction is normal and the added pronoun of the LXX is common practice in the LXX.

7 Summary

The criticisms voiced a century ago against eclectic editions are very similar to those that may be voiced today. For example, the reconstruction by Torrey in 1927 of the archetype of the parallel Psalms 14 and 53 was criticized the following year by Budde, who at the same time presented his own reconstruction

39 Van Rooy, “A New Critical Edition,” 145.

40 Crawford in Crawford–Joosten–Ulrich, “Sample Editions,” 355.

41 Van Rooy, “A New Critical Edition,” 145. The author must have meant this although the vocalized text left MT intact, and the unvocalized text (144) reflects the author’s intentions.

42 Ulrich in Crawford–Joosten–Ulrich, “Sample Editions,” 363.

in a much longer study!⁴³ The idea of producing eclectic (critical) editions is logical and has much to recommend it, but too many theoretical and practical problems stand in our way. Further, what should we do if two parallel eclectic editions of the same biblical book are published? Should we read the Bible according to Smith or according to Johnson?⁴⁴

43 C.C. Torrey, "The Archetype of Psalms 14 and 53," *JBL* 46 (1927): 186–192; K. Budde, "Psalm 14 und 53," *JBL* 47 (1928): 160–183.

44 The different projects of preparing Scripture editions were presented and discussed at a special session of the *IOSOT* congress in Munich on 5 August, 2013 organized by G. Knoppers. The papers had been pre-published in a special issue of *HeBAI*, among them a presentation by R. Hendel, "The Oxford Hebrew Bible," *HeBAI* 2 (2013): 63–99, grosso modo presenting the same approach as in earlier publications.

The Literary Development of the Book of Joshua as Reflected in the Masoretic Text, the LXX, and 4QJosh^a

1 Evaluation of the LXX

Several biblical books compete for the title of that containing the largest amount of valuable Hebrew–Aramaic data that disagrees with MT, some of which is earlier than MT and some that presents later formulations. Joshua is one such book. When summarizing my views on possible candidates for such a status, naturally one can only express one's own opinions, since scholars hold widely differing views on the large-scale differences between textual witnesses. For example, some consider the much shorter version of LXX–Job to reflect a greatly deviating Hebrew text, while I agree with those who ascribe that shortness to the Greek translator. Some ascribe the major deviations of LXX–Esther from MT⁺¹ to the translator, while I ascribe them to a Hebrew edition postdating MT; according to others, that edition preceded MT. Thus, none of these texts is a serious contender for the three ancient witnesses that in my view provide the greatest amount of valuable deviating material, LXX–Jeremiah together with 4QJer^{b,d}, LXX–Samuel in 1Samuel 16–18, and LXX–Joshua together with 4QJosh^a. You will notice that this list does not include the differing Psalms sequence in the Qumran Psalms scrolls because, in my view, they represent the Qumran prayer book, or the short 4QCant^{a,b} scrolls because they contain abbreviated versions of that book.²

This study focuses on LXX–Joshua and 4QJosh^a compared with MT+. The evaluation of LXX–Joshua is bound to be controversial because of the difficulties inherent in the evaluation of that version. One first has to establish that the deviations of the LXX from MT+ derive from a Hebrew source and are not the result of the translator's whims. In my view, trust in this translator may be established by way of an analysis of the translation character and by external support for the reconstructed Hebrew source of the LXX.

1 The siglum MT+ indicates MT together with the Targumim, Peshitta, and the Vulgate.

2 For details and bibliographical references, see Tov, "Large-Scale Differences."

1.1 *Translation Technique*

An analysis of the translation technique of LXX-Joshua is imperative in order to evaluate its text-critical value. That translation is somewhat free, but not free enough in order to ascribe shortening, expansion, and large-scale changes to the translator. Studies of various areas of the translation technique establish the translator's faithful representation of grammatical categories.

Hollenberg pointed out several groups of slightly free renderings in the LXX,³ but these did not prevent him from reconstructing many details in the *Vorlage* that were preferable to MT.⁴ In sample examinations of features in Joshua compared with other books, I characterized the translation as relatively free to relatively literal.⁵ Sollamo included Joshua in the group of relatively free translations, together with Leviticus, Genesis, Numbers, and Deuteronomy.⁶ Moatti-Fine noticed the translator's tendency to present different equivalents for the same Hebrew word; when recognized correctly, this variation should not prevent the reconstruction of the Hebrew *Vorlage*.⁷ Mazor provides further arguments in favor of retroverting elements of the Hebrew parent text of the LXX.⁸ She described the lexical variation in LXX-Joshua⁹ which should not prevent a reasonable reconstruction of the Hebrew parent text. Den Hartog's

3 J. Hollenberg, *Der Charakter der alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Buches Josua und ihr textkritischer Werth* (Moers: J.G. Eckner, 1876), 5–9 pointed to variation in lexical equivalents (5), non-stereotyped renderings (5), and freedom in small details (6), but the analysis is very general.

4 Pp. 12–20.

5 In the wake of E. Tov – B.G. Wright, "Computer-Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of Translation Units in the LXX," *Textus* 12 (1985): 149–187, I applied these criteria to Joshua in "The Growth of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Evidence of the LXX Translation," in *Greek-Hebrew Bible*, 385–396 (388). I concluded that in 58.4% of the instances, -ו was rendered as ἐν, in 53.2% וְ was rendered as ἐν, and in 83.1% the pronominal suffixes of the third person were rendered with forms of αὐτός and ἐαυτός. In addition to these absolute figures, there is also comparative material with regard to the addition of prepositions in the LXX and the relation between καί and post-position particles such as δέ and γάρ.

6 R. Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae, Diss. Hum. Litt., 19; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979), 285.

7 J. Moatti-Fine, *La Bible d'Alexandrie, Jésus (Josué)* (Paris: Cerf, 1996), 42–66.

8 L. Mazor, *The Septuagint Translation of the Book of Joshua: Its Contribution to the Understanding of the Textual Transmission of the Book and Its Literary and Ideological Development*, Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1994 (Heb. with Eng. summ.), 27–73. On p. 36, Mazor provides examples of literal renderings of particles and prepositions.

9 Ibid., 37–48.

study of some details in the translation technique of LXX did not lead to any conclusions.¹⁰

Although the translation of Joshua is not as literal as that of Jeremiah, the limited degree of freedom in this translation allows us to suggest that the translator would not have made the major changes mentioned below.

1.2 *Parallels between 4QJosh^a and LXX in a Common Short Text*

In 8:7–18, 4QJosh^a resembles LXX in two details (vv. 10, 14) and, more importantly, in its short¹¹ version of 8:11b–13 in frg. 15.¹² The exact content of the short version of these verses in the scroll is unknown since it depends upon the reconstruction of the lacuna in col. v 11. Frg. 15 l. 10 starts off with 8:10b, worded slightly differently, it continues on l. 11 with v. 11, and jumps to v. 14 in l. 12.¹³ A substantial amount of text is lacking in the scroll, which therefore must have been close to the short text of the LXX.¹⁴ The resemblance of 4QJosh^a and LXX in their short text is supported by the common readings in this small fragment.¹⁵ Disregarding l. 14, which is written in large characters, the ends of lines 10–13 agree once with both LXX and MT (כראות l. 14), and twice with LXX against MT: l. 10 הִזְקִינִים (MT זקני ישראל) and לק[ראתם (MT לקראת) (ישראל).

A second minus of 4QJosh^a in ch. 8 should be treated separately since the short text in vv. 14b–17 is not shared with the LXX and, furthermore, the scroll

10 C.G. den Hertog, *Studien zur griechischen Übersetzung des Buches Josua*, Ph.D. diss., Gießen, 1996, 160–183.

11 See § a below on 8:1–29.

12 On the other hand, elsewhere (Josh 5:2–7 and 6:6–7) this scroll does not reflect the short text of the LXX. However, in ch. 5 this argument is not conclusive, as the translator may have shortened his *Vorlage* because of contextual difficulties.

13 L. 10: v. 10b.

L. 11: v. 11a end.

L. 12: v. 14 beginning.

14 If this line included a large *vacat*, the minus of the scroll could have been identical to the LXX, but more likely the line would have included some words, while lacking most of vv. 11b–13.

15 The first preserved word in the reconstructed line 12 in col. v starts off with the end of 8:11a in frg. 16 הָעֵץ [וְ]. L. 12 ends with the second word of v. 14, כראות. On the second line of the tiny frg. 16, יִמְהַרְּנוּ [וְ] of v. 14 is the first preserved word after the lacuna. M.N. van der Meer, *Formation and Reformulation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses* (VTSup, 102; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2004), 461 suggests an alternative identification for this little fragment (8:18–19). In the reconstruction of col. v on p. 465, frg. 15 is disregarded.

may not indicate a minus at all.¹⁶ Line 13 in col. v ends with the last word of v. 14a, though with a variant לִקְ[אֶתֶם, as mentioned above. This text is not followed by v. 14b but by v. 18, written in large letters by a different hand. The space after line 13 is sometimes described as the bottom margin, but the evidence can also be explained as a running text.¹⁷ An important argument against the assumption of a bottom margin is the fact that no such margin is expected after the thirteen lines of text in col. v, since all other columns in this scroll are reconstructed as containing 27–30 lines. It therefore seems that vv. 14b–17 are lacking in 4QJosh^a, the main problem being that l. 14 is written in a different hand, hand B.¹⁸ It is unknown how many verses would have been written by hand B before hand A reappears in frgs. 17–18 (Josh 10:2–5). This issue will probably remain unresolved and, if so, it will not be known whether vv. 14b–18¹⁹ were indeed lacking in the scroll.²⁰

4QJosh^a thus supports the LXX in at least one significant minus, 8:11b–13.

-
- 16 Mazor, *Septuagint Translation* (n. 8), 210–244 links the short text in 4QJosh^a and the LXX in vv. 11b–13 with the assumption of a minus in vv. 14b–17. According to her, the absence of these two groups of verses in the scroll indicates an earlier stage in the development of the book.
- 17 The space after l. 13 is suggestive of a bottom margin, but l. 14 could have been just one letter shorter than the previous line, in which case the remains of that inscribed line would not have been preserved. It should be remembered that the inscribed top layer of the leather of this fragment has flaked away at the edges.
- 18 There are several parallels for the interchange of hands in the middle of Qumran scrolls, in one case extending for a few lines only. See my *Scribal Practices*, 20–21.
- 19 Assuming that these verses were lacking in 4QJosh^a, Mazor, *ibid.*, reconstructed the literary history behind the LXX, 4QJosh^a, and MT (in this order of development). The forces that were operative in creating the long version were theological and harmonizing. According to Mazor, the first stage in the story was secular, while MT stressed the theological aspects of the victory. Note especially the addition in MT of v. 26, in which the comparison of Joshua with Moses is supplemented by the picture in Exod 17:11–12; for a similar adaptation of Joshua to Moses in 4QJosh^a, see § 3 below. Further, the added vv. 11b–13 in MT conform to the story in Judges 20. Compared with 4QJosh^a, the addition in MT+ LXX of vv. 14b–17 was based on vv. 4–6, thus adding the execution of an earlier command, as seen often in SP.
- 20 Van der Meer, *Formation* (n. 15), 439 claims that these verses cannot be missed in the context because they “narrate how the city was left unprotected.” However, in my view, the story runs well without these verses. Realizing that frg. 15 belongs materially to the same scroll as the remainder of 4QJosh^a and that it was written by the same scribe, van der Meer, *Formation* (n. 15), 464 suggests that the fragment derived from a different column, not identified by him.

1.3 *Hebraisms in the Pluses of the LXX*

The presence of Hebraisms in the long pluses of the LXX supports the assumption that these pluses are based on a Hebrew text and were not produced by the translator.²¹ Some examples follow.

16:10 καὶ ἐνέπρησεν αὐτὴν ἐν πυρὶ = וַיִּשְׂרֹפָהּ בָּאֵשׁ. The tautological Greek expression, the Hebraistic dative instrumentalis, derives from the Hebrew.²² The same Hebraistic use of ἐν occurs in the plus following 6:26 (2×).

19:48a καὶ ἐβαρύνθη ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ Εφραιμ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς = וַתִּכְבֵּד יַד אֶפְרַיִם עֲלֵיהֶם. Likewise, 24:33b καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς κύριος εἰς χεῖρας Εγλαῶν = וַיִּתֵּן ה' בְּיַד עִגְלוֹן. Natural Greek uses case endings or prepositions where translation Greek, in the wake of the Hebrew, uses parts of the body.²³

24:31a ἐκεῖ ἔθνηκαν μετ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον εἰς ὃ ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ = וַיִּשְׂימוּ אֹתוֹ שָׁם בְּקִבְרֵי אֲשֶׁר קָבְרוּ אֶתוֹ שָׁם. The two elements εἰς ὃ ... ἐκεῖ, typical of translation Hebrew, are tautological in Greek. In the Greek Torah and Joshua, this construction appears more frequently than the alternative construction that omits the second element.²⁴

1.4 *The Samaritan Book of Joshua*

Among the agreements between the Samaritan book of Joshua (SamJosh)²⁵ and the LXX,²⁶ the absence of 8:11b–13 takes pride of place. See § 1.2. While the antiquity of SamJosh has been contested by some scholars, most notably Kahle,²⁷ it was shown by Stenhouse and Crown that the manu-

21 For the theoretical background of this argument, see Tov, *TCU*, 83–85. This argument was also used by Mazar, *ibid.*, 65–67.

22 See M. Johannesson, *Der Gebrauch der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta* (NGWG, Phil.-Hist. Kl, 1925; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1926), 333.

23 See Sollamo, *Prepositions* (n. 6).

24 See M.L. Margolis, “The Mode of Expressing the Hebrew ‘A'id in the Greek Hexateuch,” *AJSLL* 29 (1913): 237–260.

25 Published for the first time by M. Gaster, “Das Buch Josua in hebräisch-samaritanischer Rezension,” *ZDMG* 62 (1908): 209–279, 494–549.

26 See M. Gaster, “The Samaritan Book of Joshua and the Septuagint,” *PSBA* 31 (1909): 115–127 (119); 149–153; Gaster, *Josua* (n. 25), 217–218. SamJosh also differs from LXX in several details.

27 P. Kahle, “Zum hebräischen Buch Josua der Samaritaner,” *ZDMG* 62 (1908): 550–551. E. Noort, *Das Buch Josua: Forschungsgeschichte und Problemfelder* (Erträge der Forschung, 292; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998), 58–59 is reserved regarding

script of SamJosh, though written in the 14th century, utilized earlier sources.²⁸

The above arguments were meant to render support to the assumption that the LXX may be trusted as a witness to a different Hebrew text of Joshua. The features of this version are described below.

2 Two Literary Strata of Joshua in the LXX* and MT+

The Greek translation of Joshua contains material of unusual interest from a literary point of view. Some of its elements are shorter than MT+ (see § 1), others are longer (2), and yet others display a different sequence (3). Holmes followed by Orlinsky, Auld, Rofé, Tov, and Mazor suggested that MT+ and the LXX* reflect two different literary strata,²⁹ with the LXX usually representing the more ancient one.³⁰ I now realize that LXX-Joshua also contains later material.³¹

the textual value of SamJosh, stressing its importance for the later "Rezeptionsgeschichte" of Joshua.

- 28 P. Stenhouse, "Samaritan Chronicles," in *The Samaritans* (ed. A.D. Crown; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989), 218–265; A.D. Crown, "New Light on the Inter-relationships of Samaritan Chronicles from Some Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library of Manchester," 1–11, in *BJRL* 54/2 (1972): 1–32; 33–58 (33:52). Thus also R. Pummer, "The Samaritans and Their Pentateuch," in G.N. Knoppers and B.M. Levinson (eds.), *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 237–269 (242).
- 29 S. Holmes, *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Joshua* (Cambridge: University Press, 1914); H.M. Orlinsky, "The Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint of the Book of Joshua," *VTSup* 17 (1969), 187–195; A.G. Auld, "Textual and Literary Studies in the Book of Joshua," *ZAW* 90 (1978): 412–417; idem, *Joshua Retold. Synoptic Perspectives* (Old Testament Studies; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998); A. Rofé, "Joshua 20: Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated," in Tigay, *Empirical Models*, 131–147; Tov, "Growth of the Book of Joshua" (n. 5); Mazor, *Septuagint Translation* (n. 8); ead., "A Nomistic Re-Working of the Jericho Conquest Narrative Reflected in LXX to Joshua 6:1–20," *Textus* 18 (1995): 47–62.
- 30 J. Trebelle Barrera, "A Combined Textual- and Literary Criticism Analysis: Editorial Traces in Joshua and Judges," in *Florilegium Lovaniense*, 437–463 and A. Schenker, "Altar oder Altarmodell? Textgeschichte von Jos 22:9–34," in *Florilegium Lovaniense*, 417–425 recorded additional ancient variants from the Old Latin and LXX^{Luc}.
- 31 4QJosh^a represents a third independent text. On the other hand, claiming that the major differences among these three sources derive from the inner dynamics of the LXX and 4QJosh^a, van der Meer, *Formation* (n. 15), cautions against this approach. Likewise idem, "Sound the Trumpet! Redaction and Reception of Joshua 6:2–25," in *The Land of Israel in Bible, History, and Theology: Studies in Honour of Ed Noort* (ed. J. van Ruiten & J.C. de

Some of the additions are formulated as *afterthoughts*.

Josh 1:15 MT+ ושבתם לארץ ירשתכם {וירשתם אותה} אשר נתן לכם משה {עבד
יהוה}
LXX* Then you may return to your inherited land
 {and you shall take possession of it} which Moses
 {the servant of the Lord} gave unto you.

The first segment lacking in LXX* disturbs the syntax of MT.

Josh 4:10 MT+ והכהנים נשאי הארון עמדים בתוך הירדן עד תם כל הדבר אשר צוה
יהוה את יהושע לדבר אל העם {ככל אשר צוה משה את יהושע}
LXX* The priests who bore the Ark remained standing in the
 middle of the Jordan until all the instructions that the Lord
 had ordered Joshua to convey to the people had been
 carried out {just as Moses had ordered Joshua}.

According to the short formulation of the LXX*, Joshua's actions closely followed the command of God, while the plus of MT, possibly deriving from v. 12; 11:15, or Deut 3:28, stressed that the command actually was by Moses.

8:1–29. In the account of the second attack on Ai, some of the contextually difficult elements of MT are not represented in the LXX. The largest minus is in vv. 11b–13 duplicating v. 4, also lacking in 4QJosh^a. These verses may either be taken as a rival account of the setting up of the ambush described in v. 4 or as the execution of the command in that verse. The LXX also lacks the end of v. 15 and v. 16a that repeat the description of the pursuit of the Israelites by the inhabitants of Ai (v. 17), as well as v. 20b repeated in v. 21. MT+ shows signs of literary activity in all these details, as well as in small pluses in vv. 5, 18, 29.³⁴

34 See van der Meer, *Formation* (n. 15), 417–478. K. De Troyer, “Did Joshua Have A Crystal Ball? The Old Greek and the MT of Joshua 10:15, 17 and 23,” in Paul, *Emanuel*, 571–589, likewise assumed that v. 15 (as well as v. 17 and the beginning of v. 23) were added in MT. In a later paper on the same topic, De Troyer, “Reconstructing the OG of Joshua,” in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (ed. W. Kraus & R.G. Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006), 105–118, regarded vv. 15, 17, 43 as representing a late editorial stage. Van der Meer, *Formation* (n. 15), 316–317 points out the inconsistent nature of such an assumed editorial change and therefore casts doubt on its very existence. However, revisions are never consistent; see chapter 3 in this book.

2.1.1 The Encampment of the Israelites

The MT edition added some details about the encampment of the Israelites that are not found in the LXX: In 5:10 (similar to 4:19 MT+ LXX), 10:15, 43,³⁵ the Israelites are described as camping at Gilgal (> LXX). These remarks, inserted inconsistently in MT, show editorial design, described by Auld* 1979 as a “pendantic concern for the location of the camp.”³⁶

2.1.2 Theological Changes in MT

Some of the minuses of the LXX reflect theological changes in MT. Several such changes in MT were probably inserted in an earlier text represented by the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX. Thus, the LXX lacks details regarding the priestly involvement in the conquest of Jericho (MT 6:3b, 4, 6b, 9a) and divine providence governing the victory at Ai (MT 8:7b).³⁷ Further, the LXX lacks a reference to sanctuaries in 6:24 and elsewhere in the book (9:23; 24:2).³⁸

The most extensive minus in LXX-Joshua is found in the short LXX* version of ch. 20. In that chapter, Joshua is commanded to designate the cities of refuge following previous commands given to Moses; see the regulations in the Priestly code (Num 35:9–34) and in Deut 19:1–13. The short text of the LXX* and SamJosh (14:44 in Gaster’s edition)³⁹ reflects the Priestly code, supplemented in MT+ by segments from Deuteronomy, as illustrated by the Table below.

2.1.2.1 *Minuses of the LXX* in Josh 20:1–6*

This table presents MT, in which the minuses of the LXX*, printed in italics, are enclosed in angular parentheses, while the pluses of the LXX* (for which cf. Numbers 35) are printed in smaller typeface.

Then the Lord said to Joshua: ²“Speak to the Israelites, ‘Designate the cities of refuge, of which I spoke to you through Moses, ³to which a manslayer who kills a person by mistake {*unintentionally*} may flee; they, the cities, shall serve you as

35 Both identical verses in ch. 10 are lacking in the LXX.

36 A.G. Auld, “Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Texts,” in, *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament* (ed. J.A. Emerton; VTSup 30; Leiden: Brill, 1979), 5. Thus already Holmes, *Joshua* (n. 29), 4.

37 On the other hand, van der Meer, *Formation* (n. 15), 74–75, ascribes the changes in ch. 6 to the translator.

38 For additional small theological changes, see Josh 24:1 (MT Shekhem/LXX Shilo), 25 (plus in LXX mentioned above). See M. Rösel, “Die Septuaginta-Version des Josuabuches,” in *Brennpunkt*, 197–211 (208–211).

39 See n. 25.

a refuge, and the manslayer will not die from the blood avenger. {⁴*He shall flee to one of those cities, present himself at the entrance to the city gate, and plead his case before the elders of that city; then they shall admit him into the city, and give him a place in which to live among them.* ⁵*And if the blood avenger pursues him, they shall not hand the manslayer over to him; because he killed the other person without intent, having had no enmity against him in the past.* ⁶*He shall live in that city*} until he can stand trial before the congregation {*until the death of the high priest who is in office at that time; thereafter the manslayer may go back to his own town and his own home, to the town from which he fled.*'"} }

A comparison of the two texts shows that they differ *recensionally*, with the long text (MT+) developing from the short one (LXX). MT+ of Joshua 20 is written in two different styles: *grosso modo* the elements lacking in LXX* (the greater part of vv. 4–6 and the phrase בְּבִלִי דַעַת, “unintentionally,” in v. 3) reflect the content and style of the book of Deuteronomy, whereas the rest of the chapter reflects the style and content of Numbers 35 (the Priestly code). For example, compare בִּשְׁגָגָה, “by mistake,” in v. 3 found in the priestly law (Num 35:11) with the immediately adjacent phrase בְּבִלִי דַעַת, “unintentionally,” also found in Deut 19:4 (this phrase appears only in Deuteronomy and Josh 20:3).

It is suggested that the short text reflected in LXX* and formulated according to Numbers 35 reflects an early literary layer of this chapter. This assumption is supported by the internal tension between this layer and the additions in the long text of MT+. The MT+ layer of additions in Joshua contains words and sections from Deuteronomy 19 that are meant to adapt the earlier layer to Deuteronomy, an assumption which is not surprising in the book of Joshua, whose present shape also displays a Dtr revision elsewhere in the book. The additions in ch. 20 caused an internal contradiction, which further supports this assumption: according to v. 4 (the long text of MT+ and not of the LXX*), the manslayer is received into the city of refuge as one who is recognized as having killed by mistake and who thus becomes a legally acceptable refugee. His acceptance into the city of refuge is based upon the considered opinion of the elders of the city, who heard his version of the incident (vv. 4–5). On the other hand, according to the continued text in v. 6 (common to MT+ and LXX*), the manslayer has yet to be brought to trial (“until he can stand trial before the congregation”). In the short text of LXX*, in which v. 4 is lacking, this tension does not exist.

The elements lacking in various places in LXX* do not form a coherent literary layer, while in ch. 20 such a coherence is visible. Taken in their totality, these minuses reflect literary activity in MT.

Likewise, the reference to the ספר הישר in MT 10:13 (> LXX*) clearly reflects a late addition. The repetition in MT 13:33 (> LXX*) of a note excluding the Levites from the land distribution, duplicating 13:14 with some differences, likewise reflects a literary process. For further examples, see Holmes, *Joshua*, 3–6.

2.2 *Some Long Elements in the LXX* Differing from MT+, Usually Earlier than MT*

While LXX*-Joshua often presents a shorter text than MT, it also contains some significant pluses to MT that bear all the marks of a Hebrew text, visible in their Hebraic diction. Some long pluses contain phrases and parts of verses occurring elsewhere in Joshua–Judges or 1 Kings. Some of them reflect Hebrew texts earlier than MT, while others reflect Midrashic additions to the MT edition. It is often difficult to distinguish between these two options; for example, it is unclear whether the tradition regarding the flint knives “taken” by Joshua and buried by him in his grave (LXX 21:42d; 24:31a) was an original tradition deleted by MT+ or a Midrashic addition to the story.

6:26a. The implementation of Joshua’s curse on the rebuilder of Jericho in LXX* 6:26a is more or less identical to 1Kgs 16:34 MT+ LXX. The added text in the Greek Joshua did not derive from the parallel text in LXX-1Kgs,⁴⁰ but from a somewhat different Hebrew text. This plus runs parallel to the prophetic vision of the identity of that rebuilder in 4QapocrJosh^b (4Q379) 22 ii 7–15 and 4QTest (4Q175) 21–30.

The history of the tradition of the rebuilding of Jericho may be reconstructed as follows. Originally, the implementation of the curse was not included in the text, as is visible in LXX^{Luc} (borc_{2e2}), which lacks 1Kgs 16:34. At a second stage (MT and the versions except for LXX^{Luc}), a Dtr addition in 1Kgs 16:34, not connected with the surrounding verses, recorded the fulfillment of the prophecy. A third—Midrashic—stage⁴¹ in the development is reflected in the Hebrew source of LXX-Josh 6:26.

40 καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐλαχίστῳ διασωθέντι ... τὰς πύλας αὐτῆς/ Kings: καὶ τῷ Σεγυοῦβ τῷ νεωτέρῳ αὐτοῦ ... θύρας αὐτῆς. In Joshua, διασωθέντι apparently reflects the root גנב (cf. Prov 29:25 יגנב—σωθήσεται).

41 On the other hand, according to L. Mazor, “The Origin and Evolution of the Curse upon the Rebuilder of Jericho: A Contribution of Textual Criticism to Biblical Historiography,” *Textus* 14 (1988): 1–26, LXX-Joshua preceded 1Kgs 16:34.

16:10a. In the description of the territory of Joseph, upon mentioning Gezer, the LXX adds the story of Pharaoh's gift of that city to his daughter. This story has been copied from 1Kings where it fits more naturally, either in 9:16 (MT+) or after 5:14 (LXX).⁴² The two Greek versions differ in several details,⁴³ excluding the possibility that LXX-1Kings 5:14 was transferred to LXX-Joshua. The plus in LXX-Joshua expanded the mentioning of Gezer by way of Midrash.

19:47–48. LXX-Joshua contains two additional verses that are based on a Hebrew source,⁴⁴ but it is unclear which text represents the original version:

MT-Joshua	LXX-Joshua
19:47 trek of Danites to the North	19:47 territory of Dan (MT v. 48) 19:47a Danites failed to dispossess the Amorites (= Judg 1:34 LXX MT) 19:48 trek of Danites to the North, in most mss ascribed to Judah (MT v. 47) 19:48a = tribe of Joseph (Judg 1:35 LXX MT)
19:48 territory of Dan	

The anecdote embedded in the tribal list of Dan in the LXX, narrated in detail in Judges 18, includes two additional verses imported from Judg 1:34–35. Josh 19:47a (= Judg 1:34 LXX MT) provides the background to the trek of the Danites to the north. Less comprehensible is the occurrence in the LXX of Josh 19:48a = Judg 1:35 LXX MT, since this verse concerns the tribe of Joseph. The two adjacent Hebrew verses were probably transferred *en bloc* to the Hebrew source

42 According to Holmes, *Joshua* (n. 29), 63–64, the passage belonged to the Joshua tradition from where it was removed in MT+.

43 Kings προκατελάβετο/Joshua ἔλαβεν; Kings ἐνεπύρεσεν/Joshua ἐνέπρησεν; Kings τὸν χανανίτην/Joshua τοὺς χαναναίους; Kings ἀποστολή/Joshua φερνή (סִיחָלָשׁ). The two texts further differ in additional details reflecting their Hebrew sources.

44 The Hebrew source of the pluses in LXX-Joshua differs in details from Judges 1 MT LXX. Furthermore, the vocabulary of the two translations differs: Judges ἤρξατο/Joshua ὑπέμεινεν (לָחַם); Judges ἀφῆκεν/Joshua εἶων (נָתַן), excluding the possibility that the LXX-Kings version was transferred to LXX-Joshua.

of LXX-Joshua 19.⁴⁵ Alternatively, the context in LXX-Joshua reflects the original, more natural, context, abridged in MT-Joshua.⁴⁶

21:42a–d. This plus in the LXX summarizes the land division in Joshua, including the allotting of a city to Joshua. The LXX thus contains two conclusions to the major part of the book, here (LXX only) and in 19:49–50 (MT LXX).⁴⁷ The plus in LXX-21:42a–d is based on a Hebrew text differing slightly from the parallel text in ch. 19.⁴⁸ The Greek translations differ in the two segments, disallowing the suggestion that the addition in 21:42 was copied from LXX in ch. 19.⁴⁹ The addition of a conclusion to the book in the LXX thus reflects an editorial stage differing from that in 19:49–50; it was added before chapters 20–21 (the cities for refuge and the Levitical cities) were appended to the lists of tribal borders in MT+ LXX, and after that appendix had been added, in the LXX.⁵⁰ 21:42d LXX also contains a story about Joshua “taking” the flint knives used for the circumcision of the Israelites (5:2.5).⁵¹ This is the only detail told about Joshua in 21:42a–d beyond his building a city.

24:31a. This plus in the LXX continues the tradition recorded in 21:42d. After Joshua’s death, the flint knives (cf. 5:2–5) were buried in Joshua’s grave.

24:33a–b (transition between Joshua and Judges). The long plus in the LXX* after Josh 24:33 probably reflects an earlier stage in the development of the Hebrew book.

45 v 47 in MT summarizes the tribal border of Dan, preceded by a description of its northern territories. On the other hand, in the LXX, v. 47 (= v. 48 MT) summarizes the territory of Dan followed by an anecdote about its northern territories.

46 Thus Holmes, *Joshua* (n. 29), 70–71 and G.A. Cooke, *The Book of Joshua in the Revised Version* (Cambridge Bible; Cambridge: University Press, 1918), 186.

47 On the other hand, according to A. Rofé, “The Editing of the Book of Joshua in the Light of 4QJosh^a,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. G.J. Brooke with F. García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden/New York: Brill, 1994), 73–80 (74) this plus of the LXX reflects editorial manipulations subsequent to MT.

48 For example, the key word in 19:49 is reflected in 21:42a as *יִכְלוּ* (καὶ συντετέλεσεν).

49 For example, 19:49 *ἐμβατευσαι*/21:42a *διαμερίσας* (לְנַחֵל); 19:49 *κλήρον*/21:42b *μερίδα* (נַחֲלָה); 19:50 *καὶ κατῴκει*/21:42d *ῥάκησεν* (וַיִּשָּׁב).

50 For a detailed analysis, see Mazor, *Septuagint Translation* (n. 8), 249–260.

51 This addition, too, contains a translation option differing from the parallel verse: 5:5 *ἐγένοντο*/21:42d *τοὺς γενομένους* (הַיְלָדִים).

(a) ἐν ἐκεῖνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ λαβόντες οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ περιεφέροσαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ Φινεες ἱεράτευσεν ἀντὶ Ἐλεάζαρ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, ἕως ἀπέθανεν καὶ κατωρύγη ἐν Γαβαν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ. (b) οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἀπῆλθοσαν ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῶν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῶν πόλιν. καὶ ἐσέβοντο οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ τὴν Ἀστάρτην καὶ Ἀσταρωθ καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν κύκλῳ αὐτῶν. καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς κύριος εἰς χεῖρας Ἐγλωμ τῷ βασιλεῖ Μωαβ, καὶ ἐκυρίευσεν αὐτῶν ἔτη δέκα ὀκτώ.

On that day, the children of Israel took the Ark of God and carried it about among them; and Phinees exercised the priest's office, instead of Eleazar his father till he died, and he was buried in his own place Gabaan (Gibeah). (b) The children of Israel departed every one to his place, and to his own city. And the children of Israel worshiped Astarte and Astaroth, and the gods of the nations round about them; and the Lord delivered them into the hands of Eglon king of Moab and he ruled over them eighteen years.

The Hebraic diction of this passage allows for a relatively reliable reconstruction of the Greek text into Hebrew.

Most of the components of this plus are found elsewhere in MT+ LXX: for 33aβ, cf. Josh 24:33; Judg 2:9, 6 and for 33b, cf. Judg 2:11–14; 3:12, 14. The text seems to be known to the author of CD V 1–5 (thus Rofé⁵²).

Rofé, “End of the Book” demonstrated that this passage existed once in a Hebrew form in one of the early stages of a combined book of Joshua–Judges. The most remarkable aspect of the addition is that the last phrase mentions the beginning of the story of Ehud in Judg 3:12–30. The addition of LXX* preserves an ancient tradition of a combined Joshua–Judges book. The following sequence (according to MT) may be reconstructed: Joshua 24, the plus of LXX*, the story of Ehud (Judg 3:12–30), and the remainder of Judges.⁵³ The section that is now a plus in LXX* after Josh 24:33 was presumably omitted in MT+, possibly for ideological reasons (Rofé). This view was not accepted by H.N. Rösel, who considers the addition of LXX* to be secondary.⁵⁴

52 A. Rofé, “The End of the Book of Joshua according to the Septuagint,” in *Henoch* 4 (1982): 17–36.

53 As a supporting argument for this assumption, Rofé asserted that the entire section comprising Judg 1:1–3:11 in all textual witnesses is secondary. It contains (a) a collection of stories on the conquest of the land and on the failure to dispossess its inhabitants (ch. 1) that runs parallel to Joshua, (b) a late editorial introduction to the book of Judges (2:1–3:6), and (c) the story of the judge Othniel (3:7–11) whose nature as a “judge” is not clearly delineated. Presumably, Judg 1:1–3:11 was added in Judges after the original book was separated into Joshua and Judges.

54 H.N. Rösel, “Die Überlieferungen vom Josua- ins Richterbuch,” *VT* 30 (1980): 342–350

2.3 *Sequence*

The LXX differs a few times from MT+ in matters of sequence: 19:47–48 (see § 2.2), 24:28–31. The major difference is in chapters 8–9, recorded according to the numbering of MT:

1. The conquest of Ai (8:1–29).
2. A summarizing notice (9:1–2): “When all the kings west of the Jordan—in the hill country, in the Shephelah and along the entire coast of the Mediterranean Sea up to the vicinity of Lebanon, the <land of the> Hittites, Amorites, Canaanites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites learned of this, ²they gathered with one accord to fight against Joshua and Israel.”
3. The erecting of the altar (8:30–35).
4. The cunning of the Gibeonites (9:3–27).

The difference between MT+ and LXX* can also be presented as a difference in the position of the pericope about erecting the altar (8:30–35). Unconnected with the surrounding verses, this section is secondary in its context. וְאֵל, “at that time,” in 8:30 forms only an external connection between that section and its surroundings. It is possible, therefore, that this section, based on Deuteronomy 27, was added at a later period in different places within the framework of the Dtr editing of Joshua: in MT+ before 9:1–2 and in LXX* after these verses. Although there is no basic difference in meaning between these two traditions, it seems that the position of the summarizing remark in LXX* (= 9:1–2 MT) is the more plausible, for here it immediately follows the conquest of Ai (8:1–29).

In sum, confidence in the retroversion of the Hebrew source of the LXX and support for that reconstructed text found in external sources allows us to obtain insights into the literary layer(s) reflected in the LXX. The LXX preserves an ancient edition of Joshua differing significantly from the edition of MT. If the aforementioned analysis is correct, the differences between the texts were not created by scribes/copyists, but by scribes/editors involved in the final stages of the formulation of the book. The features of that edition are not one-sided as in the cases of LXX and 4QJer^{b,d} in Jeremiah, which reflect a much shorter text, since LXX-Joshua reflects shorter as well as longer and different elements. The Hebrew source of LXX-Joshua usually reflects an earlier edition than MT, but it also contains Midrashic additions involving verses from other books. It is therefore often difficult to distinguish between the two options. It

(348–349). M. Rösel, “Josuabuches” (n. 38), 207, accepts this view, arguing that the plus of LXX merely alludes to the passages in Judges, and does not provide their text.

is also difficult to characterize the differences between the two editions. MT often added exegetical details, and in one case (ch. 20) it adapted the text to the legislation of Deuteronomy. In some cases, MT possibly deleted sections that may have been considered disturbing (LXX 24:33a–b). In other cases, the LXX added Midrashic additions based on other verses in Joshua–Judges and elsewhere (most examples in § 2.2).

3 4QJosh^a/MT+, LXX

In small details, 4QJosh^a (published in *DJD* XIV) goes its own way,⁵⁵ but in large details the scroll usually follows MT+ except for three major segments, all of which may be interpreted in different ways.

1. The first four lines of col. I contain a combination of verses from chapters 8, 4, and 5, in this sequence, as well as additional elements not found in MT+, LXX. Furthermore, the verses 4:19–5:1 of MT+, LXX are not represented in 4QJosh^a.
2. The greater part of 8:11b–13 is not included in 4QJosh^a col. V and LXX. See above, 1.
3. For the possible lack of 8:14b–17, see above, 1.

These three features of 4QJosh^a, each of them open to different explanations, may point to editorial features of that scroll differing from MT+. This situation is likely at least in the case of the short text of 8:11b–13 since this short text coincides with LXX*. We now turn to an analysis of the main feature of this scroll, col. I 1–4:

Col. I 4–11 presents the running text of Josh 5:2 onwards. It would be natural for the preceding lines to present the text leading up to Josh 5:2. We believe that this is indeed the case, though with some remarkable deviations from MT+:

- (a) 4:19–5:1 (seven verses) are lacking in this description. See below.
- (b) Col. I 1–2 presents the text of 8:34–35 describing Joshua's reading of the Torah during the course of crossing the Jordan (ch. 4).

⁵⁵ A statistical comparison of the three sources does not include the major differences to be mentioned below. In small details, 4QJosh^a disagrees 11× with MT+ LXX (8:35, 35; 6:7; 7:12, 12, 12, 14, 15, 15; 8:11; 10:4) as well as 4× with MT+ when the evidence in LXX is irrelevant (10:4, 9; 7:16; 6:5). It also agrees 2× with MT+ against LXX (8:34, 35) and 6× with LXX against MT+ (8:35, 36; 7:13, 13; 8:10, 14). In one major difference, the short text of Josh 6:3–9 in LXX, the scroll agrees with MT+ against the LXX.

- (c) This new context is contained in lines 2–3 and probably the beginning of l. 4. These lines provide a rewritten version of 4:18.

The rewritten context presents the story of Joshua in a new light, in the following sequence according to MT: 8:34–35—the reading of the Torah at the time of erecting the altar (the reading is reinterpreted as taking place in the context of crossing the Jordan), 4:18—the last stage of crossing the Jordan (reinterpreted), 5:2–9—the circumcision ceremony. 4QJosh^a probably rewrote a few verses of MT+ LXX, while combining two different events, the crossing of the Jordan (ch. 3–4) and the reading of the Torah (8:34–35).⁵⁶

Scholars interpreted these lines in 4QJosh^a in different ways. By overlooking certain aspects, they did not always interpret the main message of 4QJosh^a correctly.

- a. In the presentation of ll. 1–4 by E. Ulrich in *DJD* XIV, 143–152 as “8:34–35; 5:x; 5:2–7,” the indication of “5:x” is problematic. This presentation hides the fact that 5:1 is actually not represented, while suggesting that the preserved words could reflect an element of ch. 5. However, ll. 2–4 represent a different verse, 4:18.

Disregarding the words that are denoted as “5:x,” but tacitly describing them as the “missing” verse 5:1, Ulrich explains 8:34–35 as continuing vv. 30–33 that were presumably written at the end of the previous column (not preserved).⁵⁷ Ulrich thus locates the whole pericope 8:30–35 (erecting the altar) immediately *before* the story of the circumcision in ch. 5 in ll. 2–11. According to this interpretation, the scroll deviates from the unusual sequence in MT+ LXX, according to which the altar is built at a relatively late stage in the account of the conquest, after the taking place of several events that are related between 5:2 and 8:29. On the other hand, 4QJosh^a places the erecting of the altar immediately after the crossing of the Jordan in close agreement with the command of Deut 27:1–8. According to Ulrich and Noort,⁵⁸ this sequence, probably also reflected

56 Given the limited information about 4QJosh^a, it is difficult to say what we should expect to find in ch. 8 in this scroll. Probably the reading of the Torah appeared there as well, this time in the context of erecting the altar. See n. 65 below.

57 E. Ulrich, “4QJoshua^a and Joshua’s First Altar in the Promised Land,” in Brooke & García Martínez, *New Qumran Texts* (n. 47), 89–104.

58 Ulrich, “Joshua” (n. 57); E. Noort, “4QJosh^a and the History of Tradition in the Book of Joshua,” in *JNSL* 24 (1998): 127–144; *Das Buch Josua* (n. 27), 46–59. This view was not reflected in Noort’s 1993 inaugural lecture dedicated to the erecting of the altar in Josh 8:30–35: *Een plek om te zijn. Over the theologie van het land aan de hand van Jozua 8:30–35* (Kampen: Kok Kampen, 1993).

in Josephus, *Ant.*, v 16–20,⁵⁹ represents the original story in Joshua. In Noort's perception, "the mountains Ebal and Gerizim are moved to a position in the neighborhood of Jericho/Gilgal (Deut 11:30; 4QJosh^a)."⁶⁰ For an evaluation of this view, see the analysis following Rofé's view.

b. According to Rofé,⁶¹ the scribe of 4QJosh^a advanced the passage on the erecting of the altar to its present position immediately after the crossing of the Jordan in order to portray Joshua as a law-abiding leader who executed the commands of Deut 27:2.4 exactly. As a result, while for Ulrich this scroll holds a special position in the reconstruction of the early history of Joshua, according to Rofé the scroll reflects a nomistic tendency. De Troyer likewise considers 4QJosh^a to be later than MT.⁶² The suggestion that the scroll is secondary compared with MT+, LXX has much to recommend it.

The views discussed so far are problematic since there is no evidence that the whole pericope 8:30–35 was included in col. I and the one preceding it.⁶³ Further, these scholars disregard the sequence in the scroll of crossing the Jordan in ll. 2–3 (= 4:8) and the circumcision ceremony (ll. 4–11 = Josh 5:2–7) and they also do not refer to the reading of the Torah at the time of crossing the Jordan.

c. According to van der Meer, *Formation* (n. 15), 452–478, col. I represents the running text of chapters 4⁶⁴ and 5 (crossing the Jordan and the circumcision ceremony) and not an assumed sequence ch. 4–8:30–35–ch. 5, as in the views quoted above. I agree with many of van der Meer's remarks on col. I, while

59 The evidence of Josephus is not unequivocal since he presents Josh 8:30–35 in two installments, after crossing the Jordan (*Ant.*, v 16–20) and at the end of the conquest of the country (*Ant.*, v 69–70).

60 Noort, "4QJosh^a" (n. 58), 127. *Ibid.*, 135: "... the original setting of Joshua 8:30–35 assumed Ebal and Gerizim to be located in the neighbourhood of Jericho and Gilgal."

61 Rofé, "4QJosh^a" (n. 47).

62 K. De Troyer, "Building the Altar and Reading the Law: The Journeys of Joshua 8:30–35," in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations* (ed. K. De Troyer & A. Lange; SBL Symposium Series, 30; Leiden/ Boston: Brill, 2005), 141–162. According to De Troyer, this text was rewritten by the sectarian Qumran community who "could not ... accept a crossing of the Jordan without an immediate erecting of an altar and reading the law, and thus MT needed to be reorganized. Moreover, by reorganizing the text, the Qumranites avoided mentioning an altar built on Mount Ebal" (162).

63 Thus also Noort, "4QJosh^a" (n. 58), 132 and van der Meer, *Formation* (n. 15), 511–519.

64 See אחר אשר נתקו (after they were lifted up <to the dry ground>), at the end of l. 2.

this scholar's explanation of the background of the inclusion of 8:34–35 in the present context is questionable.⁶⁵ According to van der Meer, *Formation* (n. 15), 4QJosh^a is irrelevant to the literary reconstruction of Joshua, since it does not presuppose the transposition of the pericope 8:30–35.

d. My own view is close to elements in the views of van der Meer and Rofé. At the same time, it seems to me that the beginning of col. 1 does not reflect a form of ch. 8, but a rewritten version of the end of ch. 4 utilizing 8:34–35. In this rewritten text, pride of place is given to the elements of 4:18, albeit in a different sequence. MT+ reads as follows (the italicized words are found in 4QJosh^a): “When the priests *bearing the ark* of the covenant of the Lord came up from the Jordan, (and after) the soles of their feet *were lifted up* to the dry ground (...).”⁶⁶ In 4QJosh^a, the reading of the Torah is not unexpected, since Josh 8:34 mentions such an activity, but it is not expected at this point, during or after the crossing.⁶⁷

The background of the combination of the reading of the Torah and the crossing of the Jordan has not been addressed in previous research and it is indeed a difficult one. I suggest that the reading of the Torah was inserted into the context of crossing the Jordan in the course of major rewriting of this pericope in 4QJosh^a. The crossing of the Jordan was a significant event in the report of Joshua's activities. In many ways, the description of Joshua in Scripture

65 According to van der Meer, 513, these verses were duplicated in their present position after 5:1 as a harmonizing explanation of the duplication of Deut 27:2, 4. However, Deuteronomy talks about erecting an altar and writing on the stones, and not about the reading of the Torah. Besides, Josh 8:34–35 itself speaks about the reading of the Torah, rendering it unnecessary to turn to the redundancy in Deut 27:2, 4. The assumption of the duplication of Josh 8:30–35 in the scroll is supported by the author's detailed reconstruction of the next columns in which there is room for this section in a later column (van der Meer, *Formation* [n. 15], 514–519).

66 This is the only place where the verb in the second phrase (אָהַר אֲשֶׁר נִתְקַן) occurs in Joshua (except for 8:6, 16 where they occur with a different meaning).

67 According to Josh 8:34, Joshua also read the blessings and curses, which could have been mentioned at the end of the preceding column of 4QJosh^a, but this is not likely since they are not mentioned in ll. 1–4 either. Joshua 8 combined the different ceremonies in Deuteronomy 27 by having Joshua read “the blessing and the curse,” reflecting the ancient ceremony in Deut 27:11–27. A later editor/scribe who could not imagine that Joshua would read only blessings and curses, made Joshua read also the Torah. The syntax of this verse suggests the late origin of that word. Typologically, 4QJosh^a thus reflects a later stage than MT+, since that scroll mentioned only the “Torah” without the “blessing and the curse.”

contains several parallels to Moses, including his crossing of the Jordan,⁶⁸ and the addition of the reading of the Torah at that occasion should be viewed in that light. The reading of the Torah in Josh 8:35 was adapted by 4QJosh^a to the context of crossing the Jordan in order to stress the similarity between Moses and Joshua. The reciting of the Song at the Sea by Moses in Exodus 15 after the crossing of the Red Sea forms a good parallel to the addition in 4QJosh^a. For a similar adaptation of Joshua to Moses, see 8:26 MT+ (> LXX). See n. 19.

Other parallels to Moses are contained in two unrelated textual witnesses containing hymns sung during the crossing of the Jordan in Joshua 4–5. These hymns do not exactly parallel the reciting of the Torah by Joshua in 4QJosh^a, but they illustrate the need for adding elements to the biblical story at exactly the same point.⁶⁹

- (1) After Josh 3:7, SamJosh adds a 12-line hymn sung by the priests at the occasion of crossing the Jordan. Another hymn (16 lines), this time by Joshua, paralleling Moses' Song in Exodus 15, follows 5:1.⁷⁰
- (2) A similar hymn was referred to in 4QapocrJosh^b (4Q379) frgs. 15–17, dating to the Hasmonean period.⁷¹ This composition contains a description of the crossing of the Jordan (frg. 12 and probably additional fragments) and a group of fragments, 15–17, that contain words of blessing (including מברך [בים and ברכות] as well as a possible reference to the crossing of the Jordan (ואנחנו עבר [י]ם 3 16)).

Summarizing the rewriting in 4QJosh^a, we note that the following changes were inserted in col. I 1–4:

1. The text of 8:34–35 was integrated into the description of the crossing of the Jordan with one major change: Adapting v. 35 to the new context, 4QJosh^a added the crucial words [את הירד] [בעברו] in l. 2. Although the verb occurs in the lacuna, it seems that the reconstruction is well founded.

68 See 3:7; 4:10.

69 Compare also the songs of praise sung by Joshua and the people after the erecting of the altar on Mount Ebal in Pseudo-Philo, *Biblical Antiquities*, xx1.8–9; G. Kisch, *Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (Publications in Medieval Studies; Notre Dame, IN; The University of Notre Dame, 1949), 170–171. See C. Begg, "Josephus' and Pseudo-Philo's Rewriting of the Book of Joshua," in *The Book of Joshua* (ed. E. Noort; BETL 250; Leuven/Paris/Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2012), 555–588.

70 Gaster, *Josua* (n. 25), 240–243. See further n. 28 above on the reliability of SamJosh.

71 DJD XXII, 273–275 (Newsom). See E. Tov, "The Rewritten Book of Joshua as Found at Qumran and Masada," in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 71–91.

2. 8:35 was followed by a free adaptation of 4:18, including the following ideas, extant and reconstructed: “after⁷² [the soles of the feet of the priests] were lifted up [to the dry ground, they brought up?] the book of the Torah, and afterwards the bearers of the ark came [up from the Jordan].”⁷³ This book of the Torah must have been the book from which Joshua read beforehand. Only after the book of the Torah was brought to safety on dry land did the bearers of the ark come up from the river (partially reconstructed). The emphasis on the importance of the Torah in l. 3, not expressed in Joshua 3–4, may reflect the same concern (nomistic, Midrashic?) as the reading of the Torah in ll. 1–2.
3. 4:19–5:1 are not represented in the scroll.⁷⁴ All the lacking elements may be considered secondary in the context: the date of the crossing and of the assembly at Gilgal (19), an aetiological explanation of the stones at Gilgal (20–24), and the fear of the Amorite and Canaanite kings after the miraculous crossing of the Jordan (5:1).⁷⁵ See, however, below.

Drawing conclusions on the nature of 4QJosh^a is difficult, since the data in that scroll seem to point in different directions. In small and large details, the scroll goes its own way. 4QJosh^a, a biblical scroll, deviates significantly from MT+, LXX, but it is difficult to express a view about the relation of these deviations to MT+, LXX.⁷⁶ In my view, the lack of 8:11b–13 in the scroll, supported by the LXX, could very well be ancient.⁷⁷ The non-presentation of 4:19–5:1 could also be ancient, because of its secondary character, but since the surroundings are nomistic, the whole section in col. 1 1–4 is probably exegetical. This fragment thus does not reflect a different tradition concerning the first altar in the Promised Land (Ulrich, “Joshua”), but a late exegetical tradition. I accept the mentioned views of Rofé, Noort, van der Meer, and De Troyer, who regard this major deviation as secondary in comparison with MT+, LXX. At the same time, I do not accept their

72 I take the words *אחר אשר נתקו* to be the start of a new sentence describing the following action contained in col. v 3–4.

73 The reconstructed *לֹא פָנִים* (Rofé, “4QJosh^a” [n. 47], 78) is based on vv. 16, 17, 18.

74 It is unlikely that these verses were written at the bottom of the previous column since the earlier 4:18 is included in col. 1.

75 This verse, closely connected to ch. 4, may be compared with 9:1–2 that records the gathering of the kings of Palestine for purposes of war. That verse appears at different places in MT+, LXX.

76 In its independent readings, the scroll reflects at least two mistakes, in 7:14.15. *וְלֹא פָנִים* in 7:12 seems to be exegetical.

77 The case of the absence of 8:14b–17 is less clear. See § 1.2.

specific solutions. Our own assumption of rewriting is close to the nomistic tendency detected by Rofé. In many ways, 4QJosh^a resembles exegetical texts like 4QRP, at first regarded as a group of rewritten nonbiblical texts, and now as exegetical Bible texts, at times deviating much from the other texts.⁷⁸ Both texts contain long stretches that are close to MT+, as well as greatly deviating exegetical segments.

4 Summary

Summarizing the relationship between MT+, LXX, and 4QJosh^a, we are faced with three different literary traditions.⁷⁹ LXX is usually earlier than MT+ as described in §1, but it also includes some Midrashic elements.⁸⁰ Likewise, 4QJosh^a contains both earlier and later elements than MT+. When compared with the other sources, MT+ itself contains both early and late elements. All three texts thus contain early and late elements, not in a neat pattern as observed in the Jeremiah texts, but in a much more complicated way. Probably the most important lesson we learn from comparing these texts is not their comparative value, but the fact that all three contain stages in the growth of the book of Joshua, and that each of them is also multi-layered. The exegete will have to use these elements judiciously.

If the aforementioned analysis is correct, the differences between the texts were not created by scribes/copyists, but by scribes/editors who were involved in the final stages of the formulation of the book.

78 See chapter 4 in the present volume. For a thorough critique of this option and for new ideas, see J.J. Krause, *Exodus und Eisodus: Komposition und Theologie von Josua 1–5* (VTSup 161; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 275–296.

79 This is also stressed, with much background material, by F. García Martínez, “Light on the Joshua Books from the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Book of Joshua* (ed. E. Noort; BETL 250; Leuven/Paris/Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2012), 145–159.

80 On the rich tradition of Second Temple traditions on Joshua, see A. Feldman, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran: Texts, Translations, and Commentary* (BZAW 438; Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 2014).

The Scribal and Textual Transmission of the Torah Analyzed in Light of Its Sanctity

The present study concerns the question whether or not the scribal and textual transmission of the Torah and, at an earlier period, the last stage of its editing and literary growth were influenced by the special status of these books in Judaism. To the best of my knowledge, this issue has not been discussed in the literature, not even in surveys of the Torah manuscripts at Qumran.¹

The Torah has always enjoyed a greater degree of sanctity than the other Scripture books, but did this sanctity influence its textual transmission and the last stage of its editing? We are faced with multiple forms of the Torah, in Hebrew and translation, and it is possible that some or all of them were transmitted with greater care than the other Scripture books. Ours is not a study on canon or on the reception of the Torah books—a popular term in modern research—but a study on the history of the text. After a certain period, within rabbinic Judaism, the Torah was copied with greater precision than the other books; special scribal rules were instituted for its copying, and we wish to investigate how far back we can trace this increased precision. Our investigation will proceed backwards, starting with the writing of the Torah in the Talmudic and medieval periods and ending with the earlier periods. The areas to be examined are scribal habits applied to the writing of Torah scrolls, their orthographical and textual features, the scripts used for writing, and the degree of variation between the different texts. Our working hypothesis is that the *further* back we go in time, the *less* the sanctity of the Torah influenced its textual transmission, and at an earlier stage, its editing. At the same time, even in earlier periods the sanctity of the Torah influenced a few aspects of its scribal transmission. Paradoxically, the interest in the Torah also created multiple textual forms in the last centuries BCE.

For different periods in the history of the Torah, we focus on different texts. After the first century CE, we focus on a single text tradition, the proto-Masoretic tradition, while before that time we are faced with multiple textual

1 G.J. Brooke, "Torah in the Qumran Scrolls," in *Bibel in jüdischer und christlicher Tradition: Festschrift für Johann Maier* (ed. H. Melklein et al.; BBB 88; Frankfurt: Anton Hain, 1993), 97–120; H.-J. Fabry, "Der Umgang mit der kanonisierten Tora in Qumran," in *Die Tora als Kanon für Juden und Christen* (ed. E. Zenger; Freiburg, etc.: Herder, 1996), 293–327.

forms. These different parameters need to be taken into consideration when reviewing the data.

1 The Precise Copying of Scripture in the MT Tradition

Within the corpora of Judean Desert texts, the Torah undeniably holds a central place. Within the Qumran corpus of some 930 texts, the 200 biblical texts constitute 22 percent (not counting *tefillin* and *mezuzot*), while the biblical texts in the Masada corpus constitute a larger percentage, 46.6 or 43.75 percent depending on a calculation of either fifteen or sixteen literary texts at Masada. Within the biblical corpus, a special interest in the Torah is visible in the corpora found at all the sites in the Judean Desert: 87 texts or 43.5 percent of the Qumran biblical corpus represent the books of the Torah. At sites other than Qumran, this percentage is even higher: fifteen of the twenty-five biblical texts, or 62.5 percent, preserve fragments of the Torah. The centrality of the Torah in the life of the Qumran community is emphasized further in some of the sect's regulations. For example, whenever a group of ten men convened, it was required that among them should be someone who could expound the Torah (1QS VI 6) and the members studied the Law one third of the night (*ibid.*, 7). Stegemann points out that the Torah was the main focus of biblical interest to the Qumran community, which called itself the *beth ha-Torah* in CD XX 10, 13.²

Within these Judean Desert corpora, the largest group of texts is proto-Masoretic, or proto-rabbinic in F.M. Cross's terminology.³ In the forty-six Torah texts from Qumran that are sufficiently extensive for analysis (out of a total of 51 such texts), 24 (48%) are MT-like (or are equally close to the MT and SP), 18 (39%) are non-aligned, 5 (11%) *exclusively* reflect the SP, and 1 (2%) the LXX. In the remainder of Hebrew Scripture, in the seventy-five texts that are sufficiently extensive for analysis (out of a total of 76 such texts), 33 texts (44%) are MT-like (or, in a few cases, are equally close to the MT and LXX), 37 (49%) are non-aligned, 5 (7%) reflect the LXX. The overall preponderance of MT in the Qumran corpus is thus evident, in the Torah more so than in the other books, followed by a large contingency of non-aligned texts.

2 H. Stegemann, "Die 'Mitte der Schrift' aus der Sicht der Gemeinde von Qumran," in *Mitte der Schrift? Ein jüdisch-christliches Gespräch. Texte des Berner Symposions vom 6.-12. Januar 1985* (ed. M. Klopfenstein et al.; Bern: Peter Lang, 1987), 149-184 (151-152, 159, and *passim*).

3 F.M. Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of the Discoveries in the Judean Desert," *HTR* 57 (1964): 281-299, esp. 287-292; "Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies," in *Madrid Qumran Congress*, 1-14 (9).

At the sites in the Judean Desert other than Qumran (Masada, Wadi Sdeir, Naḥal Şe'elim, Naḥal Hever, and Murabba'at), *all* the biblical fragments reflect MT.⁴

Our investigation starts with the later periods when, according to the available information, the proto-Masoretic text was the most frequently used text (the Qumran evidence covers manuscripts copied between 250 BCE and 70 CE) or the sole text used (the evidence relating to other sites in the Judean Desert covers manuscripts copied between 50 BCE and 115 CE).

The proto-Masoretic texts were internally identical, and they agree with the medieval MT. Texts found at the various sites in the Judean Desert other than Qumran were copied with great care; they should be considered on a par with the medieval Masorah manuscripts since they differ as little from the medieval manuscripts as these differ among each other. The MT-like manuscripts from Qumran are slightly more distant from the medieval manuscripts. It seems to us that this identity could have been achieved only if all the manuscripts from the Judean Desert were copied from a single source, (a) master copy (copies) located in a central place, probably the Temple until 70 CE, and subsequently in another central location (Jamnia?).⁵

The medieval copies of the Masoretic family contain a number of scribal features that go back to the Second Temple period, such as cancellation dots, paragraph indications (open and closed sections), small raised letters originally meant as correcting elements, broken letters representing damaged elements, majuscule and minuscule letters representing different sizes of letters in the original manuscripts, and a pair of *sigma* and *antisigma* parenthesis signs.⁶ All these features must have been present in the master copy from which the "corrected copies," including the Judean Desert scrolls, had been copied.

Within the tradition of the careful transmission of MT, the Torah may have been given special care, as suggested by two features:

- a. *Unequal distribution of cancellation dots.* The precision in the transmission of texts in the MT tradition is proverbial, and within that tradition the Torah

4 For detailed statistics and an analysis, see I. Young, "The Stabilization of the Biblical Text in the Light of Qumran and Masada: A Challenge for Conventional Qumran Chronology?" *DSD* 9 (2002): 364–390.

5 See my study "The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues," in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 171–188 and *TCHB*, 27–35.

6 Appearing in Num 10:35–36, these signs indicate the wrong positioning of these verses, transformed in the Masoretic tradition to inverted *nunim*. For details on all these features, see *TCHB*, 47–61.

was probably given special care. The relatively large number of cancellation dots (*puncta extraordinaria*)⁷ in the Torah (ten out of fifteen for the whole Bible) is probably significant. The unequal distribution of these cancellation dots in Hebrew Scripture does not imply that fewer words were corrected with cancellation dots in the post-Pentateuchal books, but that more care was taken to copy them in the MT archetype of the Torah.⁸

- b. *Unequal distribution of the Qere notes.* The relatively small number of *Qere* instances in the Torah seems to lead to the assumption of a smaller range of textual variation in the Torah than in the other books.⁹ By way of explanation, the *Ketiv* text probably represents the ancient copy in the Temple in which the ancients would have preferred to incorporate some variants when these became available. However, that copy evidently could no longer be changed,¹⁰ since otherwise either the *Qere* readings would have been incorporated in the text or the whole scroll would have been replaced with the *Qere* scroll. The preference for the *Qere* scroll was perhaps due to its being a newer version,¹¹ replacing several groups of archaic *Ketivs* such as the female

7 The earliest list of these instances is found in *Sifre* Numbers §69 to Num 9:10 (the ten instances in the Torah) and the full list is in the *Masorah magna* on Num 3:39. In each of these instances, the scribes of the original manuscripts, which later became MT, intended to erase the letters, as in the Qumran manuscripts.

8 Since these scribal dots were meant to erase letters, there was no need to copy them into subsequent copies. See the discussion in my *Scribal Practices*, 187–218.

9 See my study “The *Ketiv-Qere* Variations in Light of the Manuscript Finds in the Judean Desert,” in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 199–205; J. Barr, “A New Look at Kethibh-Qere,” *OTS* 21 (1981): 19–37 (32) was the first to pay attention to the statistical aspects of the occurrences of the *Ketiv/Qere* variations based on Dothan’s edition of codex L (Tel Aviv: Adi, 1976):

Low figures: Genesis (15), Exodus (10), Leviticus (5), Numbers (9), MP (29)

Medium figures: Isaiah (53), Psalms (68), Job (52)

High figures: Samuel (155), Kings (118), Jeremiah (142), Ezekiel (123).

According to Barr, Daniel with 140 instances of K/Q is a special case, since most of them are in the Aramaic section.

10 This situation reminds us of the procedures followed by the Masoretes at a later period. When adding vowels to the text, the Masoretes could no longer change the consonantal framework because that was sacrosanct, requiring them sometimes to superimpose on the letters a vocalization that went against the letters themselves. For examples, see *TCHB*, 42.

11 Thus also R. Gordis, *The Biblical Text in the Making: A Study of the Kethib-Qere* (Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1937; repr. New York: Ktav, 1971), xxviii. In Gordis’s view, after the master copy was deposited in the Temple, and when it was recognized that the scroll was occasionally in error, it was annotated with marginal corrections from other manuscripts. The procedure followed for the addition of these corrections was described in the *baraita* in *y. Ta’an.* 4.68a about the three scrolls found in the Temple court (Gordis, p. xli). However, such a procedure is not described in this *baraita*.

Qere form *'atti* corrected to *'at* and the archaic third person plural feminine *qatlah* corrected to *qatlu*.¹² The nature of the *Qere* text differed from book to book as may be expected in a corpus composed of different scrolls, and possibly a smaller number of variants was included in the Torah than in the other books.

This precision of the Masoretic tradition created a climate that influenced generations of copying. Although all the books of Scripture are sacred, the Torah is traditionally conceived of as having the highest level of sanctity and is therefore guided by a more stringent set of rules than those guiding scribes of other texts.¹³ These rules were finalized in the post-Talmudic period in the tractate *Soferim*¹⁴ and later sources, but differences between the writing of the Torah and the other Bible books were recorded already in the Talmud. Talmudic instructions distinguishing between the copying of the Torah and the other Scripture books pertain to the sizes of the bottom and top margins,¹⁵ the adding

12 For the former, see, for example, Judg 17:2 and for the latter 1 Kgs 22:49 נשברו / נשברה. For the full evidence, see Gordis, *Biblical Text*, lists 13–25. See also M. Cohen, *The Kethib and the Qeri System in the Biblical Text: A Linguistic Study of the Various Traditions* (Heb.; Jerusalem: Magnes, 2007); S.E. Fassberg, “The Origin of the Ketib/Qere in the Aramaic Portions of Ezra and Daniel,” *VT* 29 (1989): 1–12.

13 In more recent centuries, this sanctity was translated into stringent sets of rules. Thus, *Ozar Yisrael, An Encyclopedia of All Matters Concerning Jews and Judaism, in Hebrew* vol. 4 (ed. J.D. Eisenstein, [1906–1913], repr. Jerusalem n.d.) s.v. “Sepher Torah,” 251, 253 notes that the scribe of a Torah scroll should be a God-fearing person, he has to say a blessing before the beginning of the writing and before each writing of a holy name, and he has to bless the ink. S. Ganzfried, *Keset Ha-sofer* (Bnei-Brak: Lion, 1961), 10.18 notes that the scribe has to immerse himself in a *mikvah* before writing a divine name or group of such names. In J.T. Friedman’s English translation, this paragraph is presented as: “There are some zealous scribes who do not write the Name unless in a state of purity, and this is good. Sometimes, on account of this, they write a complete sheet and leave blank spaces for the Names, to write them in after they have been to the mikveh, and this is also good” (<http://www.geniza.net/ritual/keset/kesetindex.shtml>).

14 This tractate is quoted from the edition of M. Higger, *Mskt swprym wnlww 'lyh mdrš mskt swprym b* (New York 1937; repr. Jerusalem, 1970). The translation is quoted from A. Cohen, *The Minor Tractates of the Talmud, Massektoth Ketannoth* 1 (London: Soncine Press, 1965).

15 Large bottom margins enabled easy handling of the scroll and, as such, they were prescribed for Scripture by rabbinic sources, see *b. Menah.* 30a (cf. *Massekhet Sefer Torah* 2.4): The width of the bottom margin shall be one handbreadth <7.62 cm>, of the top margin three fingerbreadths <4.56 cm>, and of the intercolumnar margin two fingerbreadths <3.04 cm> <in all the books of Scripture>. In the books of the Torah the bottom margin shall be three fingerbreadths <4.56 cm>, the top margin two fingerbreadths <3.04 cm>, and

of handle sheets to scrolls,¹⁶ use of wooden bars,¹⁷ and the amount of space left between books.¹⁸ All these instructions pertain to Torah scrolls meant for liturgical reading, only for MT.¹⁹ When the tractate *Soferim* speaks about the care taken in copying Torah scrolls, it is usually mentioned in conjunction with that of ceremonial objects, *tefillin*, and *mezuzot*. Sometimes references to the writing of Torah scrolls are made in contrast to that of the Prophets and Writings, and sometimes to that of any text.

2 Precision in the Writing of Scripture in the Judean Desert Texts

The precise instructions in rabbinic literature for writing Torah scrolls are reflected not only in the medieval MT scrolls, but also in many of the scrolls from the Judean Desert that are 1,000 years older. This precision does not characterize all the texts that were extant at one time in ancient Israel, but only texts

the inter-columnar margin a thumb-breadth <2.0 cm>. The calculations are quoted from Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and the Shrine of the Book, 1983), 1.16. Likewise, *y. Meg.* 1.71d and *Sof.* 2.5 prescribe two fingerbreadths <3.04 cm> above the text and three below <4.56 cm> for all the books of Scripture, except the Torah. The discussion in these places also mentions the view of Rabbi prescribing for the Torah three fingerbreadths above the text and a handbreadth below the text.

- 16 According to *Sof.* 1.8, handle sheets should be attached to both sides of the Torah scrolls and only at the beginning of the scrolls of the Prophets (note that 1QIsa^a did not have such a handle sheet at its end).
- 17 According to *Sof.* 2.5, a single bar needs to be attached to the end of a regular scroll and two bars for the Torah scrolls, each attached to one of the extremities (*y. Meg.* 1.71d).
- 18 According to *y. Meg.* 1.71d, "<In the Torah> one has to finish in the middle of a page and to commence in the middle of the <same> page. In the Prophets one finishes at the end and begins at the top of a page, but in the Dodekapropheton this is forbidden."
- 19 For example, *Sof.* 3.8 "A scroll [some of whose letters] are faded may not be used for the lections ... (g) A scroll of the Torah in which a whole line is faded may not be used for the lections. If the greater part of a line is faded and the smaller part intact, the use of the scroll is permitted. If a Torah scroll contains an error, it may not be used for the lections. How many? One in a column, is the view of R. Judah. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel says: Even if there be one error in three columns the scroll may not be used for the lections." 3.14 "A scribe may not put upon the written part [of a Torah scroll] a reed-pen with ink on it ..." 3.17 "It is obligatory to make beautiful *zizith*, beautiful *mezuzoth*, to write a beautiful scroll of the Torah with choice ink ..." Chapters 4 and 5 of *Soferim* deal with the writing and erasure of divine names.

that derived from the circles that created and espoused MT. When we go back in time from the Middle Ages and the rabbinic period to the era of the Judean Desert texts, we can easily identify the proto-Masoretic texts as the forerunners of the medieval texts, but we recognize that these texts co-existed with many others. In the Middle Ages, MT was the only text used, but in the last centuries BCE, the proto-Masoretic texts co-existed with many others. Not all these texts shared the precision ideals of the proto-Masoretic texts, but some may have been as precise as MT. For example, we have no reason to believe that the few Qumran texts that are close to the LXX do not present a precise transmission history. These remarks pertain to 4QDeut^a, 4QJer^{b,d}, and 4QSam^a, the latter being a very carefully written scroll.

It is further remarkable that the SP, which is considered very free in its textual approach, was copied after the Qumran period with the same precision as MT. The SP has a Masorah (*tashqil*), similar to that of MT, and it has very meticulous rules for the writing and layout of the text.²⁰

The Torah in the versions of the MT and SP was transmitted with great precision, but the other books of Scripture in MT were also transmitted precisely. Since the Samaritans only accepted the Torah, their approach cannot be compared with that of other books. Further, the transmission of MT and the SP after the first century CE cannot be compared with that of other groups since after the destruction of the Second Temple there were no other organized Jewish groups except for rabbinic Judaism. We now examine the arguments *pro* and *contra* the assumption of a precise copying of the Torah in all the Judean Desert texts.

3 Special Scribal Approaches to the Torah: Positive Evidence

An examination of the writing conventions applied to the Judean Desert texts shows that *grosso modo* there is no distinction between biblical and nonbiblical, or sacred and non-sacred texts. However, there are a few exceptions pertaining to differences in a few select areas in the copying of biblical and non-biblical texts found in the Judean Desert. We first focus on the Torah scrolls:

- *De luxe* Torah scrolls. A *de luxe* format was used especially for biblical scrolls, and among them especially for Torah scrolls. From 50 BCE onwards, large

20 See A.D. Crown, *Samaritan Scribes and Manuscripts* (TSAJ 80; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 43.

de luxe scroll editions were prepared especially for MT biblical scrolls,²¹ and within that group, mainly for the Torah.²² The assumption of such *de luxe* editions is based on the following parameters: (1) Large margins usually accompany texts with a large format. (2) The great majority of the scrolls written in *de luxe* format reflect the medieval text of MT. Since the *de luxe* format was used mainly for scrolls of the Masoretic family, we assume that these scrolls followed the rules of the spiritual center of Judaism in Jerusalem, the same center that subsequently formulated the writing instructions that were transmitted in the Talmud and *Massekhet Soferim*. (3) As a rule, *de luxe* rolls are characterized by a low level of scribal intervention, and therefore had fewer mistakes that needed correction. However, the exponent of scribal intervention pertains not only to the correction of mistakes, but also to the insertion of changes in the text.²³

- *Paleo-Hebrew Torah Scrolls*. The preserved Bible texts written in the paleo-Hebrew script contain only texts of the Torah and Job—note that the latter is traditionally ascribed to Moses (cf. *b. B. Bat.* 14b–15a; cf. also manuscripts and editions of the Peshitta in which Job follows the Torah). These ancient books were thus singled out for writing in the ancient script. Texts written in the paleo-Hebrew script were copied more carefully than most texts written in the square script (see n. 33). Most of these paleo-Hebrew texts reflect the proto-Masoretic text, but since 4QpaleoExod^m (close to SP) reflects a different tradition, the very minimal scribal intervention should not be connected to the proto-Masoretic character of these scrolls,²⁴ but rather to the milieu in which scribes wrote in this special script (Sadducees?).²⁵

21 Among the 30 Judean Desert scrolls with wide top and bottom margins, twenty-two (or 73.3%) are biblical.

22 For a list, see *Scribal Practices*, 125–129. The Torah scrolls are: 2QNum^a, 4QGen^b, 4QExod^c, 4QpaleoGen-Exod^d, 4QpaleoExod^m, 4QDeut^g frg. 11, 4QDeut^{k1}, MurGen frg. 1, MurNum 6, XHev/SeNum^b, 34SeNum, MasDeut. Among the 30 Judean Desert luxury scrolls, twelve (40%) are of the Torah. This ratio is much larger than that of the Torah scrolls among *all* the literary Judean Desert scrolls: 101 (87 + 14) Torah scrolls among 1068 (930 + 138) literary scrolls or 9.5%. In these figures, the numbers in parenthesis list the Qumran scrolls first, followed by scrolls from the other sites in the Judean Desert.

23 In fact, *all* the scrolls from Naḥal Ḥever, Murabba'at and Masada, for which the margins are known are of this type, while MasLev^a (2.8cm), MasLev^b (2.7cm), and 5/6HevPs (2.5–2.7cm) come very close (all the biblical scrolls found at these sites attest to the medieval text of MT).

24 See n. 33.

25 See *Scribal Practices*, 248.

The following practices pertain not only to Torah scrolls, but to all biblical scrolls:

- Biblical texts from the Judean Desert were almost exclusively written on parchment (thus also the rabbinic prescriptions for the writing of biblical texts in *m. Meg.* 2:2; *y. Meg.* 1.71d).²⁶
- Biblical texts were inscribed on only one side of the parchment unlike an undetermined (small) number of nonbiblical opisthographs from the Judean Desert.²⁷
- A special stichographic layout was devised for the writing of several poetical sections in many biblical scrolls, as well as in one nonbiblical scroll.²⁸

In short, while some exclusive scribal traditions are known for all Scripture scrolls, only two could be located that were applied only to Torah scrolls, the writing in the paleo-Hebrew script and the employment of a luxury format.

4 Special Scribal Approaches to the Torah: Negative Evidence

In most technical areas, scribes did not distinguish between biblical and non-biblical scrolls.²⁹ This conclusion pertains to the following parameters: writing materials, technical aspects of the writing such as the length of scrolls, sheets, and columns, number of columns per sheet, height of columns, margins, horizontal and vertical ruling, repair-stitching, patching, initial and final handle sheets, use of guide dots/strokes; writing practices, such as divisions between words, small sense units (stichs and verses), and larger sense units, the special layout of poetical units, scribal marks, correction procedures, and scripts.³⁰

26 The relatively small number of papyrus fragments of biblical texts (4–6 copies out of a total of 200 biblical manuscripts; see *Scribal Practices*, 51) possibly served as personal copies. On the other hand, papyrus was used for almost all documentary texts from the Judean Desert and several literary works from Qumran.

27 See *Scribal Practices*, 68–74 and Appendix 3.

28 For details, see *Scribal Practices*, 166–178 and Table 8. See further chapter 23 in this volume.

29 Under these circumstances, it would not be unusual to find scribes who copied both a Torah scroll and other scrolls. However, so far, only one such scribe has been identified, viz., the scribe who copied the nonbiblical texts 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB and the biblical 4Qsam^c, and his hand is also visible in several corrections in 1Q1sa^a. For further details regarding Qumran scribes writing more than one manuscript, see *Scribal Practices*, 23–24.

30 The rules for the writing of sacred texts recorded in *Massekhet Soferim* and in earlier

Although further research is required, seemingly the leather used for Scripture texts was not of superior quality to that used for nonbiblical compositions. All these areas have been described in detail in my monograph *Scribal Practices*. Neither in these technical aspects nor in three additional aspects of the scribal approach were biblical scrolls singled out for special treatment:

- a. *Scribal intervention*. A calculation of the average number of corrections in each scroll³¹ shows that the approach towards biblical texts is *no* more careful than that towards nonbiblical texts. The level of scribal intervention can be measured by dividing the number of lines preserved (in full or in part) by the number of instances of scribal intervention (linear or supralinear corrections, deletions, erasures, reshaping of letters). A high level of scribal intervention (an average of one correction in less than 10 lines) is visible in 1QIsa^a and several other biblical scrolls, including two Torah scrolls.³² At the same time, many biblical scrolls display a low level of scribal intervention, especially texts written in the paleo-Hebrew script³³ as well as several other texts.³⁴ Most other Torah texts hold an intermediate position regarding the amount of scribal intervention.
- b. *Harmonizations*. The manuscripts of the Torah contain many harmonizing additions and changes in small details.³⁵ Contrary to the majority view, this phenomenon actually prevails more in the LXX than in the SP.³⁶ Although

rabbinic sources create the impression that these rules were devised especially for the writing of sacred books. However, most details recorded there pertain to writing practices employed in an identical way in nonsacred texts during the Second Temple period. For example, *Sof.* 1.15 states that texts that deviate from the norm regarding the indication of open and closed sections cannot be used as sacred writings. However, this practice, which is basically a paragraphing system, was followed in most compositions written in the Qumran period, biblical and nonbiblical. Thus, the practice itself was not sacred, but the tradition of indicating a specific type of paragraphing in a given instance was considered sacred.

31 See the tabulations in *Scribal Practices*, 279–285, 332–335.

32 4QDeut^m (Qumran scribal practice), 5QDeut, 4QJosh^b, 4QJudg^b, 4QIsa^a, 4QJer^a, 4QXI^c, 4QXI^e, 11QPsa, 4QCant^b, 4QQoh^a.

33 4QpaleoGen-Exod^l (MT), 4QpaleoExod^m (SP), 4QpaleoDeut^r (MT), 11QpaleoLev^a (independent).

34 1QDeut^b (MT and SP), that 4QLev^e (MT and SP), 4QSam^a, 4QPs^a, MurXII, 5/6HevPs.

35 For an analysis, see my study “The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical MSS,” *JSTOT* 31 (1985): 3–29; K.-R. Kim, *Studies*.

36 See Hendel, *Genesis 1–11*, 81–92; Tov, “Textual Harmonizations Deuteronomy.” See further chapters 12 and 32 in the present volume.

there are no comparative statistics regarding the level of harmonization in the various Scripture books, we cannot avoid the impression that there are more such phenomena in the Torah than in the other books. There are many details in the prose books from Joshua to 2 Kings and in Chronicles that could have been harmonized. The absence of major harmonizing in the post-Pentateuchal books must be ascribed to lack of interest in making the details in these books match one another. Presumably there was a constant interest in improving the divine message of the Torah; from a textual point of view, these improvements involved a great amount of textual freedom.

- c. *Orthography and morphology.* The scribal practice of applying a special, very full orthography and a special morphological practice to a number of Qumran scrolls was used for Torah scrolls as well. This aberrant orthography and morphology, best known from 1QIsa^a, is found also in 1QDeut^a, 2QExod^{b?}, 2QNum^{b?}, 2QDeut^{c?}, 4Q[Gen]Exod^b, 4QExod^{j?}, 4QNum^b, 4QDeut^j v–xii, 4QDeut^{k1}, 4QDeut^{k2}, 4QDeut^m.

In short, in the details described in this section, the scribal approach towards the Torah was one of freedom, such as in the matter of scribal intervention, harmonizing additions, and orthography and morphology. Within the Qumran corpus, only a few features are recognizable that single out the Torah for careful treatment, viz., the use of paleo-Hebrew script and the employment of luxury scrolls, possibly only in certain religious circles.

5 The Development of Different Textual Forms of the Torah

The further we go back in time, the less the sanctity of the Torah influenced the textual transmission and, at an earlier stage, the final stage of editing. In the last centuries CE, the transmission of the Torah manuscripts as reflected in the Judean Desert texts was no more precise than that of the other books, except for the two features recognized (luxury Torah scrolls and use of the paleo-Hebrew script) and they may have pertained only to certain groups within Judaism. This approach is also visible in the development of textual variety everywhere except for the Masoretic family.³⁷ Because of the great interest in the Torah, a sizeable number of manuscripts and new compositions were circulating, which ultimately gave rise to greater textual variation in the five Books of Moses than in the other books. Paradoxically, because of its popularity, the sacred Torah

37 Within the Masoretic family, only a limited amount of textual variety was created.

was edited and rewritten more extensively than the other biblical books. This pattern is further developed in chapter 16 in the present volume. The creation of all these texts increased the textual variation of the Torah since all these texts influenced one another.

Summary

Our point of departure was the question whether or not the scribal and textual transmission of the Torah and, at an earlier period, the last stage of its editing and literary growth were influenced by the special status of these books in Judaism. From the first centuries BCE onwards, the proto-Masoretic text, was copied and transmitted very carefully, also in the Torah. In the rabbinic literature and medieval Jewish tradition, the copying of the Torah in the Masoretic tradition was singled out for special treatment in some areas. However, the further back we go in time, the less the sanctity of the Torah influenced its textual transmission and, at an earlier stage, its editing. In the Qumran manuscripts, there are only two features that single out the Torah for careful treatment (luxury Torah scrolls and use of the paleo-Hebrew script), and they may have pertained only to certain groups within Judaism. In all other details, the scribal approach towards the Torah was one of freedom, such as in copious scribal intervention, a multitude of harmonizing additions, and unusual orthography and morphology. This approach is also visible in the creation of textual variety in all textual traditions with the exclusion of the Masoretic family. Because of the great interest in the Torah, a large number of new texts and compositions were created that ultimately gave rise to more textual variation in the five Books of Moses than in the other books. Because of its popularity and sanctity, paradoxically the Torah was edited, rewritten, and changed much more than the other biblical books.

Textual Harmonization in the Stories of the Patriarchs

The books of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture developed in different ways regarding both their literary and textual content. Each book had its own story, and thus the quantity and nature of the variant readings in a particular book or segment resulted from the complexity of its literary development and textual transmission.¹ As a result, we cannot draw analogies between the literary and textual status of one book and that of another.²

Consequently, our limited knowledge should be taken into consideration when studying the patriarchal stories in the Qumran scrolls, MT+, SP, and the LXX. We immediately add that, from a textual point of view, there is no difference between Genesis 1–11 and the patriarchal stories (Genesis 12–50), or between Genesis and the other books of the Torah.

We limit our remarks to the *last* stage of the development of the Torah as visible in the textual witnesses. As a first step in analyzing the textual features of the Torah, we turn to its sacred status.³ The Torah has a distinctive, sacred status that could have influenced scribes to approach it with special care and a lower level of intervention than that applied to the other Scripture books. However, the evidence does not support such an assumption.⁴ Paradoxically, due to its popularity, the Torah was rewritten and changed more extensively than the other biblical books in the Second Temple period, resulting in increased textual variation (see chapter 16 in this volume).

1 When faced with differing patterns of textual variation in the biblical books, we do not know to what extent they should be ascribed to real differences between these books or segments in their literary development and textual transmission, or to imaginary differences created by the vicissitudes of the preservation of ancient sources. The differing data for each book may reflect the different activities of ancient editors and/or scribes, but often coincidence played a large role in determining the nature of the textual evidence. See chapter 2 in this volume.

2 For example, the extensive differences between MT and LXX in Jeremiah may not have existed in the other prophetic books because they were not submitted to such rewriting.

3 See chapter 11 in this volume.

4 See *ibid.*

When focusing on possible textual features in the early Torah scrolls, one rarely recognizes in them textual features such as expansionistic or abbreviating characterizing the sources as a whole.⁵ On the other hand, quite unexpectedly, the Torah is distinguished from the other biblical books by the occurrence of a large number of harmonizing changes, especially additions. These additions are found in differing numbers in the textual witnesses, most frequently in the LXX and secondly in the SP group. MT also contains some harmonizing changes, but it reflects a purer text than the other witnesses.

The mentioning of the LXX as the main source for harmonizing pluses in all Scripture books and not merely in the textual witnesses of the Torah, causes some surprise when viewed in light of previous discussions in which that feature was ascribed solely to the SP. However, the data are quite clear in this regard. By way of clarification, I immediately add that our analysis excludes the large additions in the SP group in Exodus and Numbers because these are not harmonizing pluses. These large additions, sometimes involving as much as nine verses, are part of a special editorial reworking of the Torah not known from other books. This reworking is visible especially in Exodus 7–11 and the chapters in Exodus and Numbers that run parallel to Moses' speech in Deuteronomy 1–3. These changes involve duplications of other Torah verses and a few rearrangements based on the inclination of the SP group to improve the consistency of the divine message. Editorial changes are distinct from the small harmonizing alterations in SP. The principle and substance of the small harmonizing changes is shared with the LXX, while the editorial changes described above are characteristic of the SP group only.⁶

5 By way of clarification, I do not count the short LXX texts of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the story of David and Goliath as textual features, since they reflect literary activity.

6 The scribes of this group were especially attentive to what they considered to be discrepancies within and between stories in Scripture. Particular attention was paid to the presentation of the spoken word, especially that of God and Moses; it was duplicated from one context into another when the editor considered it lacking, differing, or incomplete. Ultimately, the editorial changes derive from theological concerns reflecting the wish to create narrative structures that present the stories of the sacred Torah in the most perfect way possible.

In a way, editorial changes perfect the system of small-scale harmonizations at a higher literary level. The small-scale harmonizations to be analyzed below present attempts to make the text more congruous. The large-scale editorial intervention visible in the SP group reflects the next step on the ladder of perfecting the Torah. If my intuition is correct, the smaller harmonizations such as in the *Vorlage* of the LXX thus reflect a first step in the development of a free approach towards Scripture, while the editorial changes of the SP group reflect a second stage.

Textual harmonization is visible throughout the Torah in the LXX and SP,⁷ mainly in the non-legal segments but to a lesser extent also in the phraseology used in the verbalization of the laws. On the other hand, the substance of the laws is only rarely harmonized within a specific pericope or between parallel law codes.⁸ Textual harmonization features also in other sources, though far less prominently.⁹

Textual harmonizing tendencies represent a secondary development. This activity stems from a formalistic attempt to render all the details identical when the same elements are described twice or more using different words. The Torah offers several schematic descriptions that differ slightly, such as the creation account and the patriarchal stories.¹⁰ For example, we hear the story of Joseph's encounter with Potiphar's wife three times, as told by the narrator (Gen 39:7–13), by Potiphar's wife to the members of her household (39:14–15), and in her account to Potiphar (39:17–19). The dreams of Pharaoh's cupbearer (40:9–12) and the chief baker (40:16–17) are repeated in Joseph's interpretation (40:12–15; 18–19). The details of Pharaoh's dream (41:1–7) are repeated in its interpretation (41:25–36) and in the words of the narrator (41:47–57). Likewise, there is much repetition in the words of Abraham's senior servant at the well (24:10–14), the account of the senior servant and Rebekah at the well (24:15–27), and the former's account to Laban (24:33–49). The small differences between these multiple versions provide an opportunity for making harmonizing changes, as indeed often occurred in the *Vorlage* of the LXX. In some stories, harmonizing changes have been made at almost every possible occasion.

7 The presence of harmonization in the LXX of the Torah was recognized long ago in scholarship, but it was not given the required attention since scholars did not have the broad textual outlook that characterizes modern scholarship. See Th.E. Toepler, *De Pentateuchi interpretationis alexandrinae indole critica et hermeneutica* (Halle: C. Schwetschke, 1830), 12–16; Frankel, *Vorstudien*, 79; S. Kohn, *De Pentateucho Samaritano, ejusque cum versionibus antiquis nexu* (Leipzig: G. Kreysing, 1865). The influential study of Gesenius, *Pent. Sam.*, 46–48 provides references to earlier scholarship on the relation between SP and the LXX.

8 For an exceptional example of such an harmonization, see LXX-Deut 16:7 adapted to Exod 12:8.

9 For example, note 4QDeutⁿ as discussed by Eshel, “4QDeutⁿ.”

10 Likewise, in the Homeric epos, recurring events such as the beginning of the day, battle scenes, and descriptions of meals are described with exactly the same words. The patriarchal stories contain several scenes that are described in almost the same words, while harmonizing changes are often inserted when two descriptions differ in some details.

A similar type of harmonization was noticed by Hendel and myself in the stories and schematic accounts in Genesis 1–11,¹¹ and by myself in the narrative framework and phraseology of the laws in Deuteronomy,¹² in both cases primarily in the LXX and secondarily also in SP. A brief account of the LXX's harmonizations in Numbers is provided by Dorival and Rösel.¹³ The fullest account of the data concerning the LXX and the SP in all five Torah books is found in Kyung-Rae Kim's study.¹⁴ A number of examples of harmonizing additions in the LXX were listed by Prijs and Cook.¹⁵

Within the Torah, these harmonizations are found more frequently in Genesis than in the other books, not only because its literary structure offers more opportunity for this feature, but also because the Torah was submitted to more rewriting activity than the other books.

In no other Scripture book does the reconstructed *Vorlage* of the LXX present a similar degree/level of harmonization to that in LXX-Pentateuch.¹⁶ Opportunities for harmonization present themselves first and foremost in Samuel–Kings//Chronicles, but also in Joshua//Judges, within Jeremiah, between Jeremiah 52 and 2Kgs 24:18–25:30 and elsewhere, and further in Isa 36:1–38:8//2Kgs 18:13–20:11, among the oracles against the foreign nations in the prophetic books, etc. Massive harmonization in Chronicles towards Samuel–Kings would have been counterproductive, because in that case the two books would have been identical. While there is always some harmonization in the mentioned parallel segments, basically they remain dissimilar.

Before turning to the evidence itself, we address three central issues: (1) the Greek translator's fidelity to his source; (2) the level at which the harmonization

11 See chapter 31 in this volume and Hendel, *Genesis 1–11*, 81–92.

12 Tov, "Textual Harmonizations Deuteronomy."

13 G. Dorival, *La Bible d'Alexandrie, 4: Les Nombres* (Paris: Cerf, 1994), 42–43; M. Rösel, "Die Septuaginta und der Kult: Interpretationen und Aktualisierungen im Buche Numeri," in *La double transmission du texte biblique: Hommage à A. Schenker* (ed. Y. Goldman & C. Uehlinger;OBO 179; Fribourg/Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 25–40 (29–39).

14 K.-R. Kim, *Studies*.

15 Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition*, 84–99; J. Cook, "The Translator of the Greek Genesis," in: *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)*; ed. Natalio Fernández Marcos, TECC 34; Madrid 1985), 169–182.

16 This pertains also to the harmonization detected in the other translations, but in those cases the harmonizing process, pertaining to small details only, is inner-translational. For some data, see Ch. Heller, *Untersuchungen über die Peschitta zur gesamten hebräischen Bibel, I* (Berlin: Poppelauer, 1911), 21–25; A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, vol. 4a (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 44–45.

took place (Hebrew or Greek); and (3) the frequent agreement of SP with the LXX.

1. *The translator's fidelity.* If a translation was literal, by implication the harmonizations reflected in that translation took place in his *Vorlage*. In my view, the translation technique of LXX-Genesis was faithful to its source text from Gen 1:1 onwards, but insufficient study of that translation technique has taken place so far. Previous studies by Hendel¹⁷ suggested that this translation was indeed literal. Likewise, Wevers and Rösel opined that this translation was basically literal, but both scholars struggled with the harmonizations, ascribing them to the translator.¹⁸ Likewise, Frankel and Skinner ascribed the harmonizing approach to the translator.¹⁹ Cook²⁰ and Brown²¹ were undecided.

17 Hendel, *Genesis 1–11*, 16–20; idem, “On the Text-Critical Value of Septuagint Genesis: A Reply to Rösel,” *BIOSCS* 32 (1999): 31–34.

18 J.W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993), xii; Rösel, *Genesis-Septuaginta*, 248–250. Both scholars believed that the translation was made from a text close to MT: Wevers 1993, xiii: “These Notes are also based on the presupposition that the parent text being translated was in the main much like the consonantal text of MT.” Likewise, on p. 289, Wevers ascribed the long addition in 20:2 to the translator: “Once again it illustrates the intelligent approach Gen took in interpreting his parent text; the text simply had to make sense.” On p. 343, Wevers explained the plus in the LXX of 24:4 as follows: “Specifically Abraam wants to ensure the purity of his genetic stock; the marriage must be endogamic.” Since both scholars believed that the translation was made from a text close to MT, they felt the need to ascribe the harmonizations to the translator, but it seems difficult on the one hand to maintain the translator’s faithfulness to his *Vorlage*, and on the other to assume his freedom in creating harmonizing renderings.

19 Frankel, *Vorstudien*, 78–80; J. Skinner, *Genesis* (2nd ed. International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1930), 345 on Genesis 24.

20 J. Cook, “The Septuagint of Genesis: Text and/or Interpretation?” in: *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History* (ed. A. Wénin, 315–329; Leuven/Sterling, VA: Leuven University Press, 2001). Cook recognized the Hebrew background of some harmonizations, but also acknowledged the influence of exegesis. See also Cook’s later studies: “Genesis 1 in the Septuagint as Example of the Problem: Text and Tradition,” *JNSL* 10 (1982): 25–36; “The Translator of the Greek Genesis,” in: *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)* (ed. N. Fernández Marcos; TECC 34; Madrid, 1985), 169–182.

21 W.P. Brown, *Structure, Role, and Ideology in the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Genesis 1:1–2:3* (SBLDS; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 128–132, 250 recognized harmonizing tendencies in the LXX at the Hebrew level, but in his view they are not consistent enough in order to be considered secondary. Therefore, in his view, the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX has to be taken as more original than MT.

2. *The level at which the harmonization took place.* If all instances of harmonization were created by the same hand, the changes must have taken place at the Hebrew level²² and were not created by the translator. This suggestion is based on the fact that in some cases the vocabulary of the two Greek texts—the text from which the harmonizing change was made and the presumed harmonization differs, making it highly unlikely that the translator himself was influenced by the Greek context. In the discussion below, examples are provided of differences in vocabulary, construction, and Hebrew *Vorlage*.²³

different *Vorlage*: 18:17; 20:2 (§ 1.2)

vocabulary: 24:14; 24:43; 24:44; 27:6; 34:15; 41:3 (all: § 1.1); 12:19; 31:13; 35:3 (§ 1.2)

construction: 39:18 (§ 1.1)

The differences between elements in each pair of texts preclude inner-Greek activity. The same argument was used in a similar case in Genesis 1: the Greek harmonizing plus in Gen 1:9b (“and the water that was under the sky was gathered into their gatherings, and the dry land appeared”), differing from the Greek text of v. 9a, must have been based on a Hebrew harmonizing text like 4QGen^k.²⁴

While usually no judgment can be passed on the vocabulary of the two Greek texts because the two Greek renderings use common LXX vocabulary,²⁵ in the aforementioned cases a strong argument against inner-LXX harmonization may be made. Furthermore, I believe that Greek translators, certainly literal ones, did not consider it their task to harmonize scriptural verses, especially when dealing with remote contexts.

22 In his reconstruction of the *Vorlage* of the LXX of Genesis 28, 29, 48, Sperber indeed included these harmonizing pluses: A. Sperber, *Septuaginta-Probleme (Texte und Untersuchungen zur vormasoretischen Grammatik des Hebräischen; Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament 3,13. Stuttgart: 1929)*, 58–80 referring to 28:15; 29:1, 12; 48:7, 13, 14.

23 For similar suggestions in the case of harmonizing pluses, see E. Tov, “The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical MSS.” *JSTOT* 31 (1985): 3–29 (20–21).

24 See *ibid.*

25 For example, 31:10 LXX + והאילים + (καὶ οἱ κριοί) = 31:38 MT SP LXX ואילי צאנך (κριοὺς τῶν προβάτων σου).

32:2(1) LXX + מוחנה + (παρεμβολήν) = 32:3(2) MT SP LXX מוחנה (Παρεμβολή);

42:27 LXX + צרור + (τὸν δεσμὸν) = 42:35 MT SP LXX צרות (τοὺς δεσμούς).

3. *The frequent agreement of SP with the LXX.* The fact that the LXX agrees with SP in so many harmonizations (53 [group 2 below]) strengthens the assumption of a Hebrew background for other harmonizations as well.

Turning now to the data themselves,²⁶ the definition of harmonization is as follows. Scribes adapted many elements in the text to other details appearing either in the same verse or in the immediate or remote context.

Below, we record the harmonizations in Genesis 12–50 in the MT, LXX, and SP,²⁷ as recorded in their critical editions.²⁸ Harmonizations in individual manuscripts of these sources that are often prone to harmonizing, such as in codex A of the LXX, are not recorded.²⁹ Harmonization is recognized in the following clusters in which the change/addition is found in the witness(es) registered before the “≠” sign:

1. LXX ≠ MT SP (145)
2. SP LXX ≠ MT (53)
3. SP ≠ MT LXX (31)
4. MT SP ≠ LXX (36)

The examples listed below provide a *subjective* and probably exhaustive list of the harmonizing changes in Genesis 12–50. The first line records the base text, and the second one lists the assumed harmonizing change, usually an addition.

The data are listed according to the clustering of the textual witnesses. The largest group (1) includes harmonizations exclusive to LXX, while group (2)

26 Our analysis is based on a fresh examination of the data included in the critical editions.

27 In addition, the text of the Qumran scrolls is quoted (rarely) when agreeing with one of these sources in their harmonizing readings. Usually, MT goes together with the Targumim, Peshitta, and Vulgate (see chapter 6 in this volume), but the readings of these versions have not been recorded.

28 The following editions were used: BHS; Tal–Florentin, *Samaritan Version*; J.W. Wevers, *Genesis, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate academiae scientiarum gottingensis editum*, vol. 1. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974). No data were found in the commentaries on the LXX by S. Brayford, *Genesis, Septuagint Commentary Series* (Leiden: Brill, 2007) and M. Harl, *Le Genèse, La Bible d’Alexandrie*, 1. (Paris: Cerf, 1986). Wevers, *Notes* is of some help, but see n. 18 above. In the comparison, orthographic variants are disregarded (for example, 20:2 MT הוּא / SP הִיא). Likewise, presumed deviations of the LXX due to translation technique are not taken into consideration (for example, 13:17 MT SP LXX לאֲרַכָּה וְלִרְחַבָּה where LXX leaves out the pronominal suffixes).

29 For example, Gen 47:3 A M^{ms} 29–82 etc. ἐκ παλαιοῦ (A παλαιοῦθεν) ἔως τοῦ νῦν, based on 46:34.

contains similar data taken jointly from LXX and SP. Far fewer harmonizations are exclusive to SP. MT contains virtually no harmonizing changes. In other instances, it is possible that all our witnesses contain early harmonizations, but such instances cannot be located any more.

We distinguish between harmonizations influenced by (1) the immediate context, (2) the remote context, and (3) the addition or expansion of the subject or object on the basis of the context. In the case of additions based on remote contexts, one usually recognizes the idea or phrase that triggered the harmonizing change, for example in the plus in Gen 18:5 (§ 1.1). We suggest that most harmonizations of groups (1) and (2) were conscious, while those of group (3) could have been unconscious. The harmonizations of groups (1) and (2) reflect a certain conception, almost ideology, that intertextual links should be added in order to perfect the biblical stories (cf. n. 6). Harmonizations to remote contexts (for example, 15:13; 34:24 [both § 1.2]; 17:14; 50:25 [§ 2.2]) show how well the editor–scribe knew the biblical text.

We have not included other sources of differences between the various texts, such as non-harmonizing pluses of MT SP to the LXX (for example, 19:16; 47:24; 48:14; 50:12, 14), of LXX SP to MT (for example, 27:38), of LXX to MT SP (for example, 28:13; 29:1; 35:4; 46:20–21 [different redaction]), of SP to MT LXX (30:37; 42:16 [redaction]), and textual developments (for example, 26:8, 24; 43:14).

By definition, all harmonizing additions are secondary. They were made in order to adapt one context to another one. However, the fullness of the formulation is often somewhat artificial and, in some cases, the additions are clearly secondary: 21:17a; 32:20(19) in the LXX and 20:14 in LXX SP (§ 2.1).

1 LXX ≠ MT SP (102 + 22 + 19 = 143)

1.1 *Repetition of Details Found Elsewhere in the Context (102×)*

17:10 MT SP LXX אַחֲרֵיךְ; LXX + לִדְרֹתָם + (εἰς τὰς γενεὰς αὐτῶν). Based on vv. 7, 9
MT SP LXX לִדְרֹתָם.

18:5 MT SP LXX תַּעֲבֹרוּ; LXX + לִדְרֹכָם + (εἰς γῆν ἡμῶν). Based on 19:2 MT
SP LXX לִדְרֹכָם.

After the stay of the two angels with Lot in ch. 19, Lot says “then you can rise early and go on your way” (19:2). Similarly, after the stay of the “two men” or “angels” with Abraham in ch. 18, he suggests to them: “afterwards you will pass on.” On the basis of the similarity between the two chapters, the *Vorlage* of the LXX added the words “on your way.”

18:9 MT SP LXX אַשְׁתָּךְ; LXX + וַיַּעַן + (ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς [εἰπὼν]). Probably based on v. 27 MT SP LXX וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָהָם.

- 18:13 MT SP LXX צחקה; LXX + בקרבה (ἐν ἐαυτῇ). Based on v. 12 MT SP LXX ותצחק שרה בקרבה.
- 18:16 MT SP LXX סדם; LXX + ועמרה (καὶ Γομόρρας). Based on v. 20 and *passim* MT SP LXX סדם ועמרה.
- 18:23 MT SP LXX רשע (האף תספה צדיק עם); LXX + והיה כצדיק כרשע (καὶ ἔσται ὁ δίκαιος ὡς ὁ ἀσεβής). Based on v. 25 MT SP LXX והיה כצדיק (עם רשע) להמית צדיק (עם רשע) ברשע.
- 19:10 MT SP LXX והדלת; LXX + דלת הבית (καὶ θύραν τοῦ οἴκου). Based on the context MT SP LXX הביתה ואת הדלת סגרו.
- 19:16 MT SP LXX והאנשים; LXX + המלאכים. Based on v. 1 MT SP LXX המלאכים.
- 19:33b MT SP LXX אביה; LXX + בלילה (καὶ νύκτα ἐκείνη). Based on v. 33a MT SP LXX בלילה.
- 21:12 MT SP LXX וירע הדבר; LXX + . Based on v. 11 MT SP LXX וירע הדבר.
- 21:17a MT SP LXX¹ והנער; LXX + באשר הוא שם (ἐν τοῦ τόπου οὗ ᾗ). Based on v. 17b MT SP LXX.
- In v. 17b, the angel stresses the omnipotence of God who is able to hear the boy, Hagar's son, "where he is," but v. 17a records a simple act of hearing by God.³⁰ The phrase has been copied from the end to the beginning of the verse.
- 21:29 MT SP LXX (שבע כבשת) (הכבשות); LXX + הצאן (τῶν προβάτων). Based on v. 28 MT SP LXX (צאן) (שבע כבשת הצאן).
- 21:30 MT SP LXX (שבע הכבשות) + האלה (שבע הכבשות); LXX + האלה (ταύτας). Based on v. 29 MT SP LXX (שבע הכבשות האלה) (שבע הכבשות האלה); for LXX see above)
- 22:3 MT SP LXX (אל המקום) ויקם וילך; LXX + ויבא (καὶ ἦλθεν). Based on v. 9 MT SP LXX ויבאו אל המקום.
- 23:6 MT SP LXX (מקבר מתך) (καί); LXX + שמה (ἐκεῖ). Based on v. 13 MT SP LXX ואקברה את מתי שמה.
- 24:4 MT SP LXX (כי אם) ואל משפחתי (כי אם); LXX + ואל משפחתי (καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκὴν μου). Based on v. 38 MT SP LXX (כי אם) ואל משפחתי (כי אם).
- 24:4 MT SP LXX (לכני ליצחק) (καί); LXX + משם (ἐκεῖθεν). Based on v. 7 MT SP LXX (לכני ליצחק) (לכני ליצחק) (LXX + Ἰσαάκ).
- 24:7 MT SP LXX (יהוה אלהי השמים) (καὶ ὁ θεὸς τῆς γῆς); LXX + ואלהי הארץ (יהוה אלהי השמים) (καὶ ὁ θεὸς τῆς γῆς). Based on v. 3 MT SP LXX (יהוה אלהי השמים) (יהוה אלהי השמים) (יהוה אלהי השמים).

30 Since the translation of this phrase in v. 17b is not literal, in this case the phrase in v. 17a may have been duplicated by the translator himself.

24:8 MT SP LXX ללכת אחריך; LXX + אל הארץ הזאת + (εἰς τὴν γῆν ταύτην). Based on v. 5 MT SP LXX ללכת אחרי אל הארץ הזאת.

24:14 MT SP LXX אשקה; LXX + עד אם כלו לשות + (ἕως ἄν παύσωνται πίνουσαι). Based on v. 19 MT SP LXX עד אם כלו לשות (אשאב).

The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the two Greek texts differ: the LXX in v. 19 probably reflects כל or כלם (ἕως ἄν πᾶσαι πίωσιν) as opposed to v. 14 בלו.

24:23 MT SP LXX init —; LXX + וישאל אתה + (καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτήν). Based on v. 47 MT SP LXX ואשאל אתה ואמר.

24:43 MT SP LXX והיה העלמה היצאת LXX + ובנות אנשי העיר יצאת + (καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῆς πόλεως ἐξελεύσονται). Based on v. 13 MT SP LXX ובנות אנשי העיר יצאת לשאב מים.

The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the two Greek texts differ: for v. 43 τῶν ἀνθρώπων = אנשי, v. 13 reads οἰκούντων = יושבי.

24:44 MT SP LXX אדני לבן יהוה אשר הכיח יהוה לכן; LXX + אדע כי עשית חסד עם + (τῷ ἐαυτοῦ θεράποντι Ἰσαάκ καὶ ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκειν ὅτι πεποίηκας ἔλεος τῷ κυρίῳ μου Ἀβραάμ). Based on v. 14 MT SP LXX הכחת לעבדך ליצחק ובה אדע כי עשית חסד עם אדני אברהם.

The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the Greek equivalents differ: In v. 14 עבד is rendered with τῷ παιδί σου, and for πεποίηκας v. 14 has ἐποίησας. Further, only SP has אברהם.

24:47 MT SP LXX בת בתואל; LXX + אנכי + (εἰμι). Based on v. 24 MT SP LXX בת בתואל אנכי.

24:54 MT SP LXX שלחני; LXX + ואלכה + (ἵνα ἀπέλθω). Based on v. 56 MT SP LXX שלחוני ואלכה.

24:60 MT SP LXX את רבקה; LXX + אחתם + (τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῶν). Based on v. 59 MT SP LXX את רבקה אחתם.

25:10 MT SP LXX השדה; LXX + והמערה + (καὶ τὸ σπήλαιον). Based on v. 9 MT SP LXX השדה והמערה and 23:20 והמערה.

26:21 MT SP LXX init —; LXX + ויעתק משם + (ἀπάρας δὲ ἐκείθεν). Based on v. 22 MT SP LXX.

27:6 MT SP LXX בנה הקטן; LXX + (τὸν ἐλάσσω). Based on v. 15 MT SP LXX יעקב בנה הקטן.

The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the Greek equivalents differ: for v. 6 τὸν ἐλάσσω, v. 15 reads τὸν νεώτερον.

27:36 MT SP LXX ברכה; LXX + אבי + (πάτερ). Based on v. 34 MT SP LXX.

27:43 MT SP LXX לך פדנה ארם; LXX + (εἰς τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν). Based on 28:2 MT SP LXX לך פדנה ארם.

28:15 MT SP LXX ושמרתך; LXX + בדרך + (ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ). Based on v. 20 MT SP LXX ושמרני בדרך הזה.

29:1 MT SP LXX בני קדם.

LXX + אל לבן בן בתואל הארמי אחי רבקה אם יעקב ועשו + (πρὸς Λαβάν τὸν υἱὸν Βαθουγλή τοῦ Σύρου ἀδελφὸν δὲ Περβέκαας μητρὸς Ἰακώβ και Ησαύ). Based on 28:5 MT SP LXX ועשו יעקב אם יעקב רבקה אחי הארמי.

29:9b MT SP LXX הוא רעה; LXX + את צאן אביה / את הצאן אשר לאביה + (τὰ πρόβατα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς). Based on v. 9a MT SP LXX אשר לאביה (cf. also 37:12).

30:5 MT SP LXX בלהה; LXX + שפחת רחל + (ἡ παιδίσκη Παχήλ). Based on v. 7 MT SP LXX שפחת רחל בלהה.

30:10 MT SP LXX init —; LXX + ויבא אליה יעקב ותהר + (εἰσῆλθεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτὴν Ἰακώβ και συνέλαβεν). Based on vv. 4–5 MT SP LXX.

30:12 MT SP LXX init —; LXX + ותהר + (καὶ συνέλαβεν). Based on v. 7 MT SP LXX ותהר עוד ותלד.

31:10 MT SP LXX העתדים; likewise v. 12; LXX + והאילים + (καὶ οἱ κριοί). Based on v. 38 MT SP LXX צאנך (1).

31:10, 12 MT SP LXX הצאן; LXX + והעזים + (καὶ τὰς αἴγας). Based on v. 38 MT SP LXX רחליך ועזיך.

31:13 MT SP LXX מולדתך; LXX + ואהיה עמך + (καὶ ἔσομαι μετὰ σοῦ). Based on v. 3 MT SP LXX מולדתך ואהיה עמך.

31:18 MT SP LXX ארם; LXX + וכל אשר לו + (καὶ πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ); likewise v. 31. Based on v. 21 MT SP LXX וכל אשר לו.

31:22 MT SP LXX ללבן; LXX + הארמי + (τῷ Σύρω). Based on v. 20 MT SP LXX לבן הארמי.

31:38 MT SP LXX עשרים שנה; LXX + לי + (μοι). Based on v. 41 MT SP LXX זה לי עשרים שנה.

31:41 MT SP LXX שנה; LXX + אנכי + (ἐγὼ εἰμι). Based on v. 38 MT SP LXX.

32:2(1) MT SP LXX לדרכו; LXX + וישא עיניו וירא מחנה אלהים חנה + (καὶ ἀναβλέψας εἶδεν παρεμβολὴν θεοῦ παρεμβεβληκυῖαν). Based on 33:1 MT SP LXX וישא יעקב עיניו וירא מחנה אלהים and 32:3(2) MT SP LXX עיניו וירא.

32:20(19) MT SP LXX (גם את השני גם את השלישי); LXX + ויצו את הראשון + (τῷ πρῶτῳ). Based on v. 18(17) MT SP LXX ויצו את הראשון.

This verse quotes Jacob's words to the second and third servants, but the Hebrew parent text of the LXX found it necessary to complete the picture by adding the "first." However, the "first one" was already mentioned in v. 18(17), making this addition awkward.

32:29(28) MT SP LXX כי אם ישראל; LXX + יהיה שמך + (ἔσται τὸ ὄνομά σου). Based on the preceding words in the verse: MT SP LXX שמך עוד שמך and also on 35:10 MT SP LXX יהיה שמך.

33:2 MT SP LXX (השפחות) —. LXX + שתי + (δύο). Based on v. 1 MT SP LXX שתי השפחות.

40:16 MT SP (בחלומי) אף אני; LXX + ראיתי + (εἶδον). Based on 41:22 MT SP LXX וארא בחלמי.

41:3 MT SP ותעמדה; LXX ותרענה (ἐνέμεντο). Based on v. 2 MT SP LXX ותרעינה (καὶ ἐβόσκαοντο). Cf. also 41:18 MT SP LXX ותרענה (καὶ ἐνέμεντο).

The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the two Greek texts differ.

41:4 MT SP LXX (הפרות) ותאכלנה; LXX + שבע + (ἐπτά); likewise vv. 20, 23. Based on v. 3 MT SP LXX שבע פרות אחרות.

41:6 MT SP LXX שבע שבלי; LXX + אחרות + (ἄλλοι); likewise v. 23. Based on v. 3 MT SP LXX שבע פרות אחרות; cf. also v. 19.

41:7 MT SP LXX (השבלים) ותבלענה; LXX + שבע + (οἱ ἐπτά). Based on v. 27 MT SP LXX ושבע הפרות הרקות.

41:7 MT SP LXX והדקות; LXX 4QGen^c + שדפות הקדים + (καὶ ἀνεμόφθοροι); likewise v. 23. Based on v. 27 MT SP LXX שדפות הקדים (sp: הרקות).

41:19 MT SP LXX אחריהן; LXX + מן היאר + (ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ). Based on v. 18 MT SP LXX והנה מן היאר עלת שבע פרות.

41:20 MT SP LXX (הבריות) הראשונות; LXX + וטבות + (τάς καλὰς). Based on v. 5 MT SP LXX וטבות בריאות.

41:21 MT SP LXX ואיקץ; LXX + ואישן + (ἐκκοιμήθη). Based on v. 5 MT SP ויישן (שנית). The harmonizing plus added to v. 21 occurs at the end of the first dream, just before the second dream. It is based on the assumption that one cannot have a second dream without falling asleep after the first dream, as in vv. 4–5 (ויחלם שנית) in MT and 4QGen^c, while ויישן is lacking in the OG (it is found only in the Hexapla, with a different verb, καὶ ὑπνωσεν). The plus was not influenced by the LXX of 41:5, since the word is lacking in that version.

41:24 MT SP LXX הטבות השבלי; LXX + והמלאה + (καὶ τοὺς πλήρεις). Based on v. 22 MT SP LXX שבע שבלי עלת בקנה אחד מלאה וטבות.

41:39 MT SP LXX (נבון וחכם) אין; LXX + איש + (οὐκ ἔστιν) ἄνθρωπος (φρονιμώτερος καὶ συνετώτερός σου). Based on v. 33 MT SP LXX איש נבון וחכם.

42:2 MT SP LXX משם לנו ושברו; LXX + מעט אכל + (μικρὰ βρώματα). Based on 43:2 MT SP LXX ושברו לנו מעט אכל.

42:27 MT SP LXX (כספו) את (וירא); LXX + צרור + (τὸν δεσμόν). Based on v. 35 MT SP LXX ויראו את צרות כספיהם.

42:30 MT SP LXX ויתן אתנו משמר; LXX + אל משמר + (ἐν φυλακῇ). Based on v. 17 MT SP LXX ויאסף אתם אל משמר.

42:32 MT SP LXX והקטן את אבינו היום; LXX והקטן את אבינו היום (ὁ δὲ μικρότερος μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν σήμερον). Based on v. 13 MT SP LXX והנה הקטן את אבינו היום.

Different sequence. The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the two Greek texts differ (for μικρότερος in v. 32, v. 13 has ὁ νεώτερος).

- 42:33 MT SP LXX (רעבון בתיכם) ואת; LXX + שבר + (τὸν δὲ ἀγορασμόν). Based on v. 19 MT SP LXX שבר רעבון בתיכם.
- 43:3 MT SP LXX אחיכם; LXX + הקטן + (ὁ νεώτερος); likewise v. 5. Based on 42:15, 20, 34 MT SP LXX הקטן אחיכם.
- 43:5 MT SP LXX משלח אינך ואם; LXX + את אחינו אתנו + (τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν μεθ' ἡμῶν). Based on v. 4 MT SP LXX אתנו את אחינו אתנו.
- 43:7 MT SP (את אחיכם) הורידו; LXX הביאו (ἀγάγετε). Based on 42:34 MT SP LXX הקטן והביאו את אחיכם and 42:20.
- 43:16 MT SP LXX בנימין; LXX + אחיו בן אמו + (τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν ὁμομήτριον [most MSS]). Based on v. 29 MT SP LXX אמו בנימין אחיו בן אמו.
- 43:26 MT SP (ארצה) לו (וישתחו); LXX + אפים + (ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν). Based on 42:6 MT SP LXX ארצה לו אפים וישתחו.
- 44:5 MT SP LXX init; LXX + גביעי גביעי את גבתם את גביעי גביעי הכסף + (ἵνα τί ἐκλέψατέ μου τὸ δῶμα τὸ ἀργεῖον). Partially based on v. 2 MT SP LXX הכסף ואת גביעי גביעי גביעי הכסף.
- 44:32 MT SP LXX אליך; LXX + והצגתיו לפניך + (καὶ στήσω αὐτὸν ἐναντίον σου). Based on 43:9 MT SP LXX אליך והצגתיו לפניך.
- 47:9 MT SP (מגורי) ימי שני; LXX + חיי + (τῆς ζωῆς μου). Based on v. 8 MT SP LXX ימי שני חייך.
- 47:14 MT SP LXX שברים אשר הם שבירים; LXX + ויכלכל + (καὶ ἐσιτομέτρει αὐτοῖς). Based on v. 12 MT SP LXX יוסף ויכלכל.
- 47:19a MT SP LXX (אלי ה' ואתם) ואדמתנו; LXX + תשם + (ἐρημωθή). Based on v. 19b MT SP LXX תשם לא תשם.
- 47:19 MT SP LXX זרע וזרע; LXX + וזרע + (ἵνα σπείρωμεν). Based on v. 23 MT SP LXX הזרע וזרע וזרע.
- 47:20b MT SP LXX שדהו; LXX + לפרעה + (τῷ Φαραῶ). Based on v. 20a MT SP LXX.
- 48:14 MT SP LXX (ימינו) את; SP LXX + את יד + (τὴν χεῖρα τὴν δεξιάν). Based on v. 17 MT SP יד ימינו.

1.2 Remote Context (22×)

- 12:6 MT SP LXX (עד מקום שכם) בארץ; LXX + לארכה + (εἰς τὸ μῆκος αὐτῆς). Based on 13:17 MT SP LXX ולרחבה בארץ לארכה ולרחבה.

In 13:17, the phrase denotes the extensive wandering of Abraham in all directions in Canaan in accord with the divine promise made to him, while in 12:6 the text refers to Abraham's travel from point *a* to point *b*, until he reached Shechem. Since Abraham probably traveled from north to south, the addition makes appropriate use of 12:6.

- 12:19 MT SP LXX (קח ולך) הנה אשתך; LXX + לפניך + (ἐναντίον σου). Based on 24:51 MT SP LXX הנה רבקה לפניך קח ולך.

The situations are different, while the phrases are similar. In 12:19, Pharaoh utters these words to Abraham regarding Sarai, and in 24:51 they are Laban's

32:6(5) MT SP LXX (חן בעיניך); למצא; LXX + עבדך + (ὁ παῖς σου); likewise 33:8. Based on 19:19 MT SP LXX חן בעיניך עבדך.

34:24 MT SP LXX וימלו; LXX + את בשר ערלת + (τῆς σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας αὐτῶν). Based on 17:14 MT SP LXX.

35:3 MT SP LXX (בדרך); ויהי עמדי; LXX + ושמרני + (καὶ διέσωσέν με). Based on 28:20 MT SP LXX בדרך ושמרני עמדי.

The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the two Greek texts differ (28:20: καὶ διαφυλάξῃ με).

35:4 MT SP LXX אשר עם שכם; LXX + ויאבדם עד היום הזה + (καὶ ἀπώλεσεν αὐτὰ ἔως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας). Based on Deut 11:4 MT SP LXX ויאבדם יהוה עד היום הזה.

35:27 MT SP LXX הוא חברון; LXX + בארץ כנען + (ἐν γῇ Χανάαν). Based on 23:2 MT SP LXX הוא חברון בארץ כנען.

35:28 MT SP LXX ימי יצחק; LXX + אשר חי + (ἄς ἔζησεν); likewise 5:27. Based on 5:5 MT SP LXX אשר חי ימי אדם and 25:7 MT SP LXX.

40:17 MT SP LXX (ו)העוף; LXX + השמים + (τοῦ οὐρανοῦ); likewise 40:19. Based on 1:26, 28, 30 MT SP LXX ובעוף השמים.

44:29 MT SP LXX אסון; LXX + בדרך + (ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ). Based on 42:38 MT SP LXX וקראהו אסון בדרך.

50:22 MT SP LXX (ובית אביו); הוא; LXX + ואחיו וכל + (καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ πᾶσα ...). Based on 47:12 MT SP LXX בית אביו ואת כל אחיו ואת.

1.3 Addition/Expansion of Subject/Object, etc. (19×)

14:14 MT SP LXX (אחיו); נשבה; LXX + לוט + . Based on v. 16 MT SP LXX אחיו לוט.

16:8 MT SP LXX ויאמר; LXX + לה מלאך יהוה + (αὐτῇ ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου). Based on vv. 7, 9 MT SP LXX.

19:35b MT SP LXX עמו; LXX + את אביה + (μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς). Based on v. 35a MT SP LXX.

24:3 MT SP LXX לבני; LXX + ליצחק + . Based on 24:4 MT SP LXX לבני יצחק.

21:26 MT SP LXX ויאמר; likewise 24:31; 43:23 MT SP LXX; LXX + אליו + (αὐτῷ). Based on the context.

24:67b MT SP LXX (אמו); אחרי; LXX + שרה + . Based on the context. For the reverse phenomenon, see v. 67a.

26:7 MT SP LXX לאשתו; על רבקה אשתו; LXX + על רבקה אשתו + (περὶ Ῥεβέκκας τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ). Based on 25:21 MT SP LXX אשתו רבקה.

26:19 MT SP LXX בנחל; LXX + גר + . Based on v. 17 MT SP LXX גר בנחל.

27:36 MT SP LXX ויאמר; LXX + עשו לאביו + (Ἦσαν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ). Based on 27:34 MT SP LXX ויאמר לאביו.

30:23 MT SP LXX ותלד; LXX + ליעקב + . Based on v. 5 MT SP LXX ותלד ליעקב בן.

32:30(29) MT SP LXX נא; LXX + לי + (μοι) = 4Q158. Based on the context.

34:5 MT SP LXX טמא; LXX + בן חמור (ὁ υἱὸς Εμμώρ). Based on v. 2 MT SP LXX שכם בן חמור.

39:4 MT SP LXX בידו (נתן); LXX + ביד יוסף (διὰ χειρὸς Ἰωσήφ). Based on v. 6 MT SP LXX ביד יוסף.

41:26 MT SP LXX חלום; LXX + פרעה . Based on v. 25 MT SP LXX חלום פרעה.

44:9 MT SP LXX אתו ימצא; LXX + הגביע (σῆμα δὲ). Partially based on v. 12 MT SP LXX הגביע.

44:13 MT SP LXX איש ויעמס; LXX + אמתחתו (τὸν μάρσιπον αὐτοῦ). Based on the context.

48:13 MT SP LXX ויגש; LXX + אתם (αὐτοῦς). Partially based on v. 10 MT SP LXX ויגש אתם אליו.

2 SP LXX ≠ MT (34 + 6 + 13 = 53)

2.1 *Repetition of Details Found Elsewhere in the Context (34×)*

12:20 MT SP LXX לו אשר ואת אשתו ואת כל אשר לו; SP LXX + ולוט עמו (αἰ Λώτ μετ' αὐτοῦ). Based on 13:1 MT SP LXX עמו לו ולוט עמו.

14:10 MT SP LXX (ועמרה) מלך; SP LXX + מלך (βασίλευς). Based on the context.

15:10 MT SP LXX ואת הצפורים; SP LXX + ואת הצפורים (τὰ ἐξ ὄρνεα). Based on v. 9 MT SP LXX ותר וגו'.

17:19 MT SP LXX (שרה) אבל; SP LXX + הנה (ἰδοὺ). Based on 18:10 MT SP LXX והנה בן לשרה אשתך.

18:29, 30 MT SP LXX לא אעשה; SP LXX + לא אשחית (οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσω). Based on v. 28 MT SP LXX.

19:12 MT SP LXX המקום מן המקום; SP LXX + הזה (τούτου). Based on v. 13 MT SP LXX את המקום הזה.

19:30b MT SP LXX בנתי בנתי; SP LXX + עמו (μετ' αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 30a MT SP LXX ונתי בנתי עמו.

20:14 MT SP LXX (צאן ובקר ועבדים ושפחת) ויקח אבימלך; SP LXX + אלף כסף (χίλια δίδραχμα). Based on v. 16 MT SP LXX.

The harmonization in this verse reveals its secondary nature. According to v. 14 MT, Abimelech gave Abraham “sheep and oxen, and male and female slaves,” but according to v. 16 MT SP LXX he told Sarah that he had given him “a thousand pieces of silver.” That monetary unit may have been the value of the items he had given Abraham according to v. 14. However, the SP LXX version of v. 14 added this detail from v. 16, and thus according to that version Abraham received twice as much in reparation.

21:8 MT SP LXX יצחק; SP LXX + בנו (ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ); likewise 25:5 based on v. 6 MT SP LXX. Based on vv. 4, 5 MT SP בנו יצחק.

- 21:13 MT SP LXX **בן האמה**; SP LXX (most MSS) + **הזאת** + (ταύτης). Based on v. 10 MT SP LXX **האמה הזאת**.
- 22:16 MT SP LXX **את יחידך**; SP LXX + **ממני** + (δι' ἐμέ). Based on v. 12 MT SP LXX **ולא חשכת את בנך את יחידך ממני**.
- 23:17 MT SP LXX **לפני (ממרא)**; SP LXX **על פני** (κατὰ πρόσωπον). Based on v. 19 מערת שדה המכפלה על פני ממרא.
- 24:15 MT SP LXX **לדבר**; SP LXX + **אל לבו** + (ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ). Based on v. 45 MT SP LXX **אכלה לדבר אל לבי**.
- 26:5 MT SP LXX **אברהם**; SP LXX + **אביך** + (ὁ πατήρ σου); likewise 28:4. Based on v. 3 MT SP LXX **לאברהם אביך**.
- 26:7 MT SP LXX **אשתי**; SP LXX + **היא** + (ἐστίν). Based on the context and 12:19, 20:2 MT SP LXX **אחת היא**.
- 31:33 MT SP LXX **לבן**; SP LXX + **ויחפש** + (ῥέυστησεν). Based on v. 35 MT SP LXX.
- 32:24(23) MT SP LXX **(אשר לו)** —; SP LXX + **כל** + (πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ). Based on 31:21 MT SP LXX **וכל אשר לו**.
- 35:9b MT SP LXX **אתו**; SP LXX + **אלהים** + (ὁ θεός). Based on v. 9a MT SP LXX **וירא אלהים**.
- 38:13 MT SP LXX **לתמר**; SP LXX + **כלתו** + (τῇ σύμφῳ αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 11 MT SP LXX **לתמר כלתו**.
- 38:21 MT SP LXX **אנשי מקום**; SP LXX **אנשי המקום** (τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ τόπου). Based on v. 22 MT SP LXX.
- 38:25 MT SP LXX **והפתיל**; SP LXX **והפתיל** (καὶ ὁ ὄρμισκος). Based on v. 18 MT SP LXX **ופתיל**.
- 39:8 MT SP LXX **מאומה** (οὐδὲν). Based on v. 23 MT SP LXX **את כל מאומה בידו**.
- 39:13 MT SP LXX **וינס**; SP LXX + **ויצא** + (καὶ ἐξῆλθεν); cf. 39:18 (§ 1.1). Based on v. 12 MT SP LXX **וינס ויצא החוצה**.
- 41:35 MT SP LXX **(ה)אכל (השנים)**; SP LXX + **שבע** + (ἐπτά). Based on v. 29 MT SP LXX **שבע שנים**.
- 41:43 MT SP LXX **ויקראו (לפניו)**; SP LXX **ויקרא** (καὶ ἐκάλεσαν). Based on the preceding singular verbs in vv. 42–43.
- 41:48 MT SP LXX **היו שני שנים**; SP LXX + **השבע** + **היה** + (ἦν ἡ εὐθηνία). Based on v. 53 MT SP LXX **שבע שני השבע**.
- 42:28 MT SP LXX **הנה**; SP LXX + **הוא** + (τοῦτο). Based on v. 27 MT SP LXX **והנה הוא בפי**.
- 43:18 MT SP LXX **השב (הכסף)**; SP LXX **המושב** (τὸ ἀποστραφέν). Based on v. 12 MT SP LXX **הכסף המושב**.
- 44:24 MT SP LXX **אבינו**; SP LXX **אבינו** (πατέρα δὲ ἡμῶν). Based on v. 25 MT SP LXX.
- 44:31 MT SP LXX **אין הנער**; SP LXX + **אתנו** + (μεθ' ἡμῶν). Based on v. 30 MT LXX **והנער אינו אתנו**.

47:16 MT SP LXX + לחם (ἄρτους). Based on v. 15 MT SP LXX להבה לנו לחם.

50:25 MT SP LXX + אתכם (μεθ' ὑμῶν). Based on the context.

2.2 Remote Context (6×)

15:21 MT SP LXX + ואת החיו (καὶ τοὺς Εὐαίους). Based on Exod 23:23 MT SP LXX + ואת החיו והכנעני והפרזי והחתי והאמרי (cf. SP LXX) and similar passages.

17:14 MT SP LXX + ביום השמיני (τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ὀγδόῃ). Based on Lev 12:3 MT SP LXX.

21:13 MT SP LXX + גדול (μέγα). Based on v. 18 MT SP LXX + גדול (שער) שניאיו.

24:60 MT SP LXX + איביו (τῶν ὑπεναντίων). Based on 22:17 MT SP LXX + שער איביו.

25:8 MT SP LXX + ימים (ἡμέρας) (זקן) ושבע ימים. Based on 35:29 MT SP LXX + ימים ושבע ימים.

50:25 MT SP LXX + אתכם (μεθ' ὑμῶν). Based on Exod 13:19 MT SP LXX + אתכם (והעלתם) את עצמתי (מזה).

This example shows how well the harmonizing scribe of Genesis knew the Scripture text. Joseph's words in Gen 50:25 are quoted with a slight expansion in Exod 13:19, and this text was in turn inserted in SP LXX in Genesis.

2.3 Addition/Expansion of Subject/Object, etc. (13×)

12:7 MT SP LXX + לו (αὐτῷ). Based on the context.

14:19a MT SP LXX + ויברך את אברם (καὶ εὐλόγησεν τὸν Ἀβράμ). Based on v. 19b MT SP LXX.

21:30 MT SP LXX + ; אברהם ; likewise v. 33; 24:14. Based on the context.

29:23 MT SP LXX + יעקב . Based on the context.

37:36 MT SP LXX + את יוסף (והמדנים מכרו). Based on the context.

39:4 MT SP LXX + בעיני אדניו (ἐναντίον τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 2.

39:11 MT SP LXX + יוסף . Based on the context.

43:22 MT SP LXX + לקחנו (ἡγάκαμεν). Based on 43:12 MT SP LXX + ובסוף משנה קחו בידכם.

47:3 MT SP LXX + אחי יוסף (τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς Ιωσήφ). Based on the context.

48:7 MT SP LXX + אמן (ἡ μὴτηρ σου). Based on the context.

3 SP ≠ MT LXX (21 + 4 + 6 = 31)

3.1 *Repetition of Details Found Elsewhere in the Context* (21×)

12:16 MT SP LXX צאן ובקר מאד + SP; .

Based on 13:2 MT SP LXX ובזהב בכסף ובזהב.

16:14 MT LXX קרא; SP קראה; likewise 29:34, 38:3, 29, 30. Based on v. 13 MT SP LXX ותקרא שם יהוה.

17:24 MT SP לא ימול את בשר + SP + את . Based on v. 14 MT SP ערלתו (בשר ערלתו) ערלתו.

18:20 MT SP הכצעקתה (SP); SP זעקת סדם; SP זעקת סדם.

19:6 MT LXX סגרו (πρoσέφξεν); SP ויהדלת (סגר) ויהדלת סגרו.

19:12 MT LXX האנשים (οἱ ἄνδρες); SP המלאכים. Based on v. 1 MT SP LXX שני המלאכים; cf. also v. 15.

19:13b MT SP להשחיתה. Based on v. 13a SP משחתים.

23:8 MT SP LXX בעפרון בן צחר + SP + החתי . Based on v. 10 MT SP LXX עפרון החתי

24:20 MT LXX ותער (ἐξεσένωσεν); SP ותוריד. Based on 24:18 MT SP LXX ותדר בדה.

24:22 MT SP LXX משקלו + SP + וישם על אפה . Based on 24:47 MT SP ואשם הנזם על אפה.

24:45 MT SP LXX השקיני נא + SP + מעט מים מכדיך . Based on 24:43 MT SP LXX.

26:22 MT LXX ויחפרו. Based on v. 19 MT SP LXX.

30:16 MT SP LXX תבוא + SP + הלילה . Based on v. 15 MT SP LXX לכן ישכב עמך הלילה.

31:33 MT LXX האמהות (שתי) (νῶτα παῖδες οὗτοί εἰσι); SP השפחות.

SP is based on the usual description of Zilpah and Bilha as השפחות. The LXX does not differentiate between the two Hebrew words.

31:53b MT SP לאלהי אברהם; SP לאלהי אברהם. Based on v. 53a MT SP LXX.

39:23 MT SP LXX (הוא עשה יהוה מצליח) ואשר; SP וכל אשר. Based on v. 3 MT SP LXX וכל אשר הוא עשה יהוה מצליח בידו.

3.2 *Remote Context* (4×)

20:11 MT SP LXX ויאמר אברהם; SP + כי יראתי . Based on 26:7 MT SP LXX ויאמר אחתי הוא כי ירא לאמר. The situations are similar, cf. § 1.2.

20:13 MT SP LXX מבית אבי + SP + ומארץ מולדתי . Based on 24:7 MT SP LXX מבית אבי ומארץ מולדת and 12:1 MT SP LXX.

45:23 MT SP LXX (מצרים) + SP + ארץ . Based on 45:18 MT SP טוב ארץ מצרים; cf. also v. 20.

50:5 MT SP LXX אבי השביעני + SP + לפני מותו . Based on 50:16 MT SP LXX אביך צוה לפני מותו.

3.3 *Addition/Expansion of Subject/Object, etc. (6×)*

18:19 MT SP LXX יצוה; SP + אברהם +; likewise 24:27. Based on the context.

18:29 MT SP LXX ויאמר; SP + אליו +; likewise 29:7; 47:1. Based on the context.

47:2 MT SP LXX לָקַח; SP + עמו +. Based on the context.

4 MT SP ≠ LXX (17 + 3 + 16 = 36)

4.1 *Repetition of Details Found Elsewhere in the Context (17×)*

19:3 MT SP LXX ויפצרו באיש בלוט מאד; MT SP + מאד +. Based on v. 9 ויפצרו באיש בלוט מאד.

21:4 MT SP LXX יצחק בןו; MT SP + בנו +. Based on 21:5 MT SP LXX יצחק בןו.

24:67a MT SP LXX האהלה (εἰς τὸν οἶκον [ἡδὺς μνηστῆρος αὐτοῦ]); MT SP + שרה +. Based on the context. Reverse phenomenon in v. 67b (§ 1.3).

30:28 MT SP LXX init —; MT SP + ויאמר +. Based on MT SP LXX 30:27.

30:38 MT SP LXX (בבאן) —. MT SP + ויחמנה +. Based on 30:39 (38) MT SP LXX ויחמו.

30:40a MT SP LXX בצאן; MT SP + לבן +. Based on v. 40b MT SP LXX צאן לבן.

31:24, 29 MT SP LXX יעקב; MT SP + (רע) מטוב עד +. Based on 31:29 MT SP עד מטוב רע.

31:52a MT SP LXX לא אעבר אליך; MT SP + את הגל הזה +. Based on v. 52b MT SP LXX לא תעבר אלי את הגל הזה.

34:15 MT SP LXX init (בזאת נאות) —; MT SP + אך +. Based on v. 22 MT SP LXX אך בזאת יאתו.

36:31 LXX אדום; MT SP בארץ אדום. Based on 35:16 MT SP LXX אדום and *passim*.

41:27 MT SP LXX הפרות הרקות; MT SP + והרעת +. Based on v. 20 MT SP LXX הפרות הרקות והרעות.

42:2 MT SP LXX (הנה) —; MT SP + ויאמר +. Based on v. 1b MT SP LXX.

42:2 MT SP LXX וישברו לנו; MT SP + משם +. Based on the context.

42:13 MT SP LXX אנחנו; MT SP + בני איש אחד +. Based on v. 11 MT SP LXX בני איש אחד (א) נחנו.

45:18 MT SP LXX (מצרים) — (את טוב); MT SP + ארץ +. Based on v. 20 MT SP טוב כל ארץ מצרים.

50:12 MT SP LXX בני לו כן; MT SP + וכיעשו; MT SP + כאשר צום +. Based on v. 16 MT SP LXX אביך צוה לפני מותו.

4.2 *Remote Context (3×)*

18:4 MT SP LXX (מים) —; MT SP + מעט +. Based on 24:17 MT SP LXX הגמאיני נא (מים) השקיני נא מעט מים and 24:43 השקיני נא מעט מים.

25:12 MT SP LXX הָגַר; MT SP + הַמְצִרִית + . Based on Gen 16:3, 21:9 MT SP LXX.
 50:5 MT SP LXX לֵאמֹר; MT SP + הִנֵּה אֲנֹכִי מֵת + . Based on 48:21 MT SP LXX.

4.3 *Addition/Expansion of Subject/Object, etc. (16×)*

20:3 MT SP LXX וַיֹּאמֶר (καὶ εἶπεν); MT SP + לוֹ + ; likewise 28:1; 34:11; 40:9; 42:10.

Based on the context.

26:15 MT SP LXX (אֲבִיו) — (בִּימִי); MT SP + אֲבֵרָהֶם + . Based on the context.

27:34 MT SP LXX וַיֹּאמֶר; MT SP + לְאֲבִיו + . Based on the context.

29:12 MT SP LXX וַיִּגַּד; MT SP + יַעֲקֹב + ; likewise 42:1b, 4. Based on the context.

35:29 MT SP LXX וַיִּגֹּעַ; MT SP + יִצְחָק + . Based on the context.

40:11b LXX הָכֹס; MT SP פָּרַעַה. Based on v. 11a.

42:18 MT SP LXX וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים; MT SP + יוֹסֵף + . Based on the context.

43:14 MT SP LXX וּשְׁלַח; MT SP + לָכֶם + . Based on the context.

46:5 MT SP LXX בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל; MT SP + אֶת יַעֲקֹב + . Based on the context.

6 Some Conclusions

1. *Statistics.* LXX contains by far the greatest number of unique harmonizations (143) in Genesis 12–50, with SP (31) and MT (1) trailing far behind. Since all three sources also share harmonizations with the other two, these instances have to be added to each source's unique features, in which case the numbers for the three sources are

LXX 196

SP 120

MT 36

These numbers do not constitute the combined number of harmonizations in these chapters, since many instances are shared by two sources.

The following features are recognized:

- a. When comparing the LXX of Genesis 12–50 with the other textual witnesses, by far the largest number of harmonizations is found in the LXX.
- b. A similar picture was noticed for the first eleven chapters of Genesis, for Numbers, Deuteronomy, and for the Torah as a whole.³²

³² See notes 12–15 above. See Hendel, *Genesis 1–11*: SP ≠ LXX MT 13; SP MT ≠ LXX 6; SP ≠ MT LXX 13; LXX ≠ MT SP 66. The combined figures for the individual witnesses in Genesis

- c. In absolute terms, Genesis (especially LXX-Genesis) contains more harmonizations than the other books of the Torah, but it should be remembered that the book is longer.³³ The frequent occurrence of harmonizations in Genesis was also noticed, without examples, by Frankel.³⁴
- d. When including books beyond the Torah, LXX-Genesis still contains the largest number of harmonizations in any one Scripture book. This supposition cannot be proven in absolute terms, and is therefore based on a general impression of the textual evidence.
- e. Insufficient material is available regarding harmonizations in pre-Samaritan sources in Genesis. On the other hand, in the other books of the Torah, these sources contain more harmonizations than the LXX and SP.³⁵
- f. The LXX stands out not only regarding its number of harmonizations, but also in relation to their nature. The harmonizations in that source are more extensive than those in the SP and the MT. For example, most of the common harmonizations of the SP and MT consist of single words supplying a subject or object (§ 4.3).
- g. By definition, all harmonizing additions are secondary. Furthermore, the fullness of the formulation is slightly artificial and, in some cases, the additions are clearly secondary.
- h. In my view, the harmonizing additions represent the most characteristic textual feature of the LXX in the Torah.
- i. The preponderance of harmonizations in the LXX of Genesis, especially in the patriarchal stories, provides food for thought on the general character of the LXX in the Torah. See further chapter 16 in this volume.

are LXX 79, SP 32, MT 6. For Deuteronomy, Tov, "Textual Harmonizations Deuteronomy," provided the following figures: MT SP ≠ LXX 44; LXX ≠ MT SP 99; SP LXX ≠ MT 27; SP ≠ MT LXX 22; MT ≠ SP LXX 2; MT LXX ≠ SP 8. The combined figures for the individual witnesses are LXX 134, SP 93, MT 54.

33 The five books in *BHS* contain respectively 85, 71, 50, 73, and 70 pages.

34 Frankel, *Vorstudien* gives the figure of 270–280 instances for Genesis, 100 for Exodus, 70–80 for Leviticus, 50–60 for Numbers, and 60–70 for Deuteronomy, without precise references. Our figures are relatively close to those of Frankel.

35 See chapter 27 in this volume.

Hebrew Lexicography and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible in Light of Gesenius' Dictionary

1 Background

The grammatical study of biblical Hebrew and Aramaic almost exclusively refers to the linguistic analysis of the vocalized medieval text of MT. This is understandable, since the foundations of this discipline were laid at a time when the horizon for the knowledge of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture was not wider than MT. The study of so-called biblical Hebrew was and is equivalent with the analysis of MT. SP's existence was known when biblical Hebrew started to be analyzed critically, but that text was studied separately as an exponent of the Samaritan tradition, and not as part of biblical Hebrew. Until recently the ancient versions were not used for the study of biblical Hebrew although in cases of well-established reconstructions they could have been used in the area of syntax and possibly also in a lexicon. The main area within grammatical studies in which the LXX was consulted is that of the transcriptions in the LXX and the second column of the Hexapla. Otherwise the LXX is not quoted in grammars such as Gesenius–Kautsch, *Grammar* or Stade.¹ SP is quoted but only minimally. This unusual situation continued also after the discovery of the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls. At the same time, all these tools are named “grammars of biblical Hebrew.”

A similar situation obtains with regard to *lexicography*. The existing lexicons focus on MT, but their titles are more encompassing, referring to Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture as a whole. For example, E. König, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament mit Einschaltung und Analyse ... sowie ... der Massoretischen Randbemerkungen ...*;² F. Brown, S.R. Driver & C.A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic, Based on the Lexicon of William Gesenius as Translated by Edward Robinson* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1907) = BDB. Likewise, the most frequently used lexicon in the twenty-first century, *HALOT*, is named *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*.³ The extent to which the lexica are

1 B. Stade, *Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Grammatik* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1879).

2 5th ed.; Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1886.

3 Ed. L. Koehler & W. Baumgartner; Leiden: Brill, 1953; 2nd ed., 1958; 3rd ed.: 1967–1996; trans.

focused on MT is shown by the phrase “*mit Einschaltung und Analyse ... sowie ... der Massoretischen Randbemerkungen*” that features with pride on the title page of König’s lexicon (1886). The name of *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* by D.J.A. Clines⁴ is more appropriate since it indicates that it is not limited to the so-called Old Testament according to MT. Its scope is wider than that of the other lexicons, but in the area of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture it focuses as much on MT as the other tools.

The tradition of almost exclusive attention to MT in critical lexicographical scholarship started with the first edition of W. Gesenius, *Hebräisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch über die Schriften des Alten Testaments* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1810–1812) = *HW*.

Although the textual horizon of early lexicographers was limited, we note a growing awareness of the non-Masoretic sources in the lexicons especially in the twentieth century, but they were never taken fully into consideration. The lexicography of biblical Hebrew and Aramaic remains focused on MT, with occasional attention to other traditions. While the situation that prevailed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is understandable, now in the twenty-first century the time is ripe for a new approach. That said, one must realize that the preparation of a comprehensive biblical lexicon is problematic since the recording of elements from SP and the Judean Desert scrolls would necessarily involve the inclusion of some linguistically late elements.

Standing at the beginning of the history of recording biblical Hebrew and Aramaic is the monumental lexicographical activity of Gesenius, a veritable genius. In his *Handwörterbuch* (1810–1812) he did not create new entries for the non-Masoretic witnesses in addition to or in the place of the headwords of MT, but in the entries themselves a few non-Masoretic data were mentioned. Sometimes Gesenius mentions details from the versions as a source for the lexicographical analysis (see below), while in other cases the mentioning of the LXX is no more than a formality. The *Thesaurus*⁵ covers more data from the versions, especially the LXX, but here, too, the mentioning of that translation is often no more than a formality (see n. 12). Gesenius was aware of the fact that the procedure of using and evaluating details in the versions and their comparison with MT was not developed sufficiently (*HW*, *Einleitung*, xxiv–xxv).

M.E.J. Richardson et al.; Leiden, 1994–2000. The 3rd edition is also available in a computer module in several computer programs (*Accordance*, *BibleWorks*, *Logos*).

4 Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press & Sheffield Phoenix Press, 1993–.

5 *Thesaurus philologicus criticus Linguae hebraeae et chaldaee Veteris Testamenti*, I–III (2nd ed.; Leipzig: Vogel, 1829–1858).

2 Textual Principles in Gesenius' Lexicographical Œuvre

The principles of Gesenius's lexicographical activity are laid down in the introduction to vols. I and II of the first edition of the *HW* (1810, 1812), and in a separate essay introducing the second edition (1823).⁶ Gesenius experienced the limitations of the analysis of a limited corpus such as the Hebrew Bible and, in the introduction to vol. I of the *HW* in 1810, he constantly speaks of this source as "the Hebrew dialect," which he intended to describe while taking into consideration the relation between that dialect and "related Semitic dialects" (*Einleitung*, IV). Lexicographers should be wary of imposing the meanings of words in one dialect on those in another one (*Einleitung*, V). He also mentions his indebtedness to Schultens and Michaelis (*Einleitung*, VI).

Gesenius was more careful and systematic than his predecessors, and he was aware of the limitations of lexicographical recording deriving from the paucity of available sources. In his view, the lexicographical description of MT needs to be supplemented by consulting the Targumim and the Peshitta (*Einleitung*, XII–XIII), and secondarily also the LXX and the Vulgate (*Einleitung*, XVII). These sources provided Jewish exegetical traditions about the words to be recorded, directly or indirectly (for example, Jerome received instruction from rabbis). As an example, Gesenius mentions the derivation of צרתני in the LXX V S in Ps 139:5 יצ"ר enriching our information on that verb. Gesenius states that the exegesis of the ancient versions helps him in gathering lexicographical information. However, their reconstructed *Vorlage*⁷ is not taken into consideration as a source to be recorded because their reconstruction into Hebrew would be too tentative.⁸

In Gesenius' time, the non-Masoretic sources were much fewer than today. Gesenius had a negative view of SP and possibly for that reason he did not often consult that version.⁹ He was aware of the differences between Masoretic medieval manuscripts, of inner-Masoretic variants (*Ketiv-Qere*) and of differences between inner-biblical parallel texts. On the one hand, he disregarded some of these textual sources, while on the other he claimed that the lexicographer has to untie several textual knots before describing their meaning. These deliberations need not be shared with the readers.

6 *Über die Quellen der hebräischen Wortforschung nebst einigen Regeln und Beobachtungen über den Gebrauch derselben*, also published separately as "On the Sources of Hebrew Philology and Lexicography," *Biblical Repository* III, 9 (trans. E. Robinson, 1833).

7 Gesenius uses the term "Varianten" (*Einleitung*, xxv).

8 In this regard, Gesenius states that he does not accept the view of C.B.W. Michaelis, *Beurtheilung der Mittel* (Göttingen: Abram Van den Hoeks Witwe, 1757), 324.

9 See the seminal study on that version that he was to write a few years later: *Pent. Sam.*

Although Gesenius recognized the validity of textual criticism (in his terminology, “Wortkritik”),¹⁰ he portrayed its importance as more limited than is now accepted in modern times, and he decided against the inclusion of textual variants in his *HW*.¹¹ Rather, they should be included in the greater work, the *Thesaurus*. When writing these thoughts in 1810 Gesenius did not know that when the *Thesaurus* was finally published (1829–1858) it would actually only rarely contain such material.¹² In the meantime, such variants need to be included in the commentaries of the biblical books (*Einleitung*, XXIV). At the same time, Gesenius felt that the non-recording of variants resulted in a loss of information for scholarship. Thus, in MT Ps 22:17, כַּאֲרִי is taken as “as a lion,” but if the variant כֶּאֱרוֹ (Manuscript de Rossi 337, etc.) had been taken into consideration, probably a verb כֶּאֱרָ should have been recorded (*Einleitung*, XXIV).¹³

In Gesenius’ system, several types of interchanges of letters, such as phonetic changes and *metathesis* are considered linguistic and not textual phenomena.¹⁴

Summarizing the sources *disregarded* in the *HW*, Gesenius mentions the following three that, he notes, should be covered by the *Thesaurus* (*Einleitung*, XXIV).

a. All inner-Masoretic textual variations (κ–Q and inner-biblical parallels). In Gesenius’ view, the lexicographer, acting as a textual critic, needs to decide on the correctness of one of the two forms. In the case of κ–Q variations only one form should be recorded.

10 *HW*, I.LXXII, II.XV. See also the study of R. Kratz, “Lower and Higher Criticism in Hebrew Lexicography,” in *Biblische Exegese und hebräische Lexikographie: Das “Hebräisch–Deutsche Handwörterbuch” von Wilhelm Gesenius als Spiegel und Quelle alttestamentlicher und hebräischer Forsummerbung, 200 Jahre nach seiner ersten Auflage* (ed. S. Schorch & E.-J. Waschke; BZAW 427; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), 364–382.

11 *HW*, I.LXXII–XXIII.

12 In the following examples, to be discussed below, textual evidence is not mentioned in the *Thesaurus*: כַּאֲרִי (Ps 22:17) בֶּן נְעוּת הַמִּדְדוֹת (1 Sam 20:30) בְּפָרִים שְׁלֶשָׁה (1 Sam 1:24); הַדּוֹרִים (Isa 45:2). On the other hand רִדְנִים (1 Chron 1:7; II.1266), דְּרִנִּים (Gen 10:4; I.322), and אֲדִיר (Gen 49:7; I.28) in SP are extensively discussed in the *Thesaurus*. In his study “Greek Bible and Hebrew lexicography: Gesenius’ use of the Septuagint,” on pp. 317–330 in *Biblische Exegese*, M. Rösel analyzes Gesenius’ use of the LXX. Rösel shows that Gesenius turns to the LXX especially in the case of “words denoting plants, animals or stones” and *hapax legomena*.

13 However, neither כַּאֲרִי nor כֶּאֱרָ are mentioned in the *Thesaurus*.

14 *HW*, *Einleitung*, II.XII–XIV.

Gesenius included:

2 Kgs 5:12 אֲמָנָה Q (= T, S) and not אֲבָנָה K. The proper noun Amanah is recorded in *HW*, I.48 without reference to the K, while there is no entry אֲבָנָה, Abanah in the *HW*.¹⁵

Isa 45:2 אִישׁ־ Q and not אוֹשֶׁר K (thus *Einleitung*, XXII). However, neither form can be found in the *HW*.¹⁶

Gen 10:4 דְּדָנִים and not the parallel reading 1 Chron 1:7 רְדָנִים (in the entry דְּדָנִים, the *HW*, I.183–184 discusses the readings of SP and LXX ad loc. as well as רְדָנִים in Chronicles and the possible identification of this people). The *HW* includes only a reference to דְּדָנִים in the entry רְדָנִים.¹⁷

On the other hand, when lacking the necessary criteria for distinguishing between forms, Gesenius recorded both:

2 Kgs 24:15 אֱלִי הָאָרֶץ K/ אֱלִי הָאָרֶץ Q (*HW*, I.17, 32)

2 Chr 26:21 חֲפָשִׁית K/ חֲפָשׁוֹת Q (*HW*, I.319)

b. Variants reconstructed from the ancient versions. The neglect of the text-critical use of the versions is actually quite unusual for Gesenius' time since the versions had been used critically since the middle of the 17th century by such scholars as Cappellus, Morinus, and Richard Simon.¹⁸

c. Conjectures (emendations). Gesenius warned against conjectures,¹⁹ changes of vocalization, and different word divisions that are not supported by any evidence and therefore not included in the *HW*.²⁰ As an example of a conjecture

15 The *Thesaurus*, I.16 includes such an entry.

16 In the *Thesaurus* II.642, the K is mentioned.

17 On the other hand, the *Thesaurus* includes extensive entries for both דְּדָנִים (II.1266) and רְדָנִים (I.322).

18 J. Morinus, *Exercitationum biblicarum de hebraei graecique textus sinceritate libri duo* (Paris, 1633; 2nd ed.: G. Meturas, 1660); L. Cappellus, *Critica Sacra* (Paris: Cramoisy, 1650; Halle: Hendel, 1775–1786); Richard Simon, *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* (Paris: Éditions de Paris, 1680/Rotterdam: Leers, 1685; repr. Frankfurt: Minerva, 1973).

19 This statement may be true for the *HW*, but בִּלְעָזָם in Isa 11:15 (below) is presented as a conjecture in the *Thesaurus*.

20 Gesenius mentioned several scholars who were too hasty in suggesting such conjectures: A.F. Houbigant, *Notae criticae in universos Veteris Testamenti libros* (Frankfurt: Varrentrapp Filium & Wenner, 1777); J.D. Michaelis, *Supplementa ad lexica hebraica* (Göttingen: Rosenbusch, 1792) and the latter's students, while he praises the caution of E.F.C. Rosenmüller.

in the area of vocalization, he mentioned בִּיָּה (‘‘comfort’’) created from בִּיָּה MT in Ps 68:5 by J.D. Michaelis, *Supplementum*, but disregarded in the *HW*, I.369.

In the generations following Gesenius, the revisers of the *HW* increasingly included more textual data in the lexicon, which went through no less than eighteen editions between 1823 and 2010.²¹ Gesenius himself prepared four editions of the *HW* in addition to the *Thesaurus*: a shortened edition in 1815,²² a second edition in 1823, a third edition in 1828, a Latin translation of the third edition in 1833,²³ and a fourth edition in 1834. Subsequent editions bear Gesenius’ name, but their editors embedded in them much of their own thinking: F.E.C. Dietrich (editions 5–7: 1857, 1863, 1868), F. Mührlau & W. Volck (editions 8–11: 1878, 1883, 1886, 1890), F. Buhl (editions 12–17: 1895, 1895, 1905, 1910, 1915, 1921), and R. Meyer, H. Donner, & J. Renz (edition 18: 1987–2009, incomplete). The translations²⁴ also display their translators’ lexicographical principles, in particular BDB, which is more in the nature of a new lexicon than a translation.

With the twelfth edition by F. Buhl (Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel, 1899), which included more textual material than previous editions, a new era began. At the same time, that edition did not include non-Masoretic readings, which were included in the later editions as well as in BDB’s translation.²⁵ As was often the case in earlier scholarship, and remains so today, editors use the misleading term ‘‘emendations’’ for these non-Masoretic readings since they are used to correct MT, so to speak. BDB includes these so-called emendations as well

-
- 21 A very helpful list of the various editions (revisions) and translations of this lexicon as well as some major reviews is found in E.F. Miller, *The Influence of Gesenius on Hebrew Lexicography* (Contributions to Oriental History and Philology 11; New York: AMS Press, 1966), 103–105.
 - 22 *Neues Hebräisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament mit Einschluss des biblischen Chaldaeismus. Ein Auszug aus dem grosseren Werke* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1815).
 - 23 *Lexicon manuale hebraicum et chaldaicum in Veteris Testamenti libros post editionem germanicum tertiam* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1833).
 - 24 The first translation was that by C. Leo, *A Hebrew Lexicon of the Books of the Old Testament* (Cambridge: University Press, 1825–1828). Subsequent translations are by J.W. Gibbs (Andover, MA: Flagg & Gould, 1824, 1832; London: Howell & Stewart, 1828, 1832); E. Robinson (Boston: Crocker and Brewster, 1836–1854); S.P. Tregelles (London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1846; 2nd ed.: 1857; repr. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1950, 1974); BDB (Oxford: Clarendon, 1907).
 - 25 P. viii: ‘‘It has been the purpose to recognize good textual emendations, but not to swell the list by conjectures which appeared to lack a sound basis. There is still much to do in textual criticism, and much which has been done since the printing of this Lexicon began would receive recognition if extensive revision were now possible’’ (signed 1906).

as conjectures, readings not found in any source. The 18th edition of the *HW* reflects some of the results of modern textual research.

The editors of the 18th edition state that it differs little from the 17th in matters of textual criticism, “wobei schon immer klar war und geblieben ist, dass auf diesem Gebiet die Erwartungen und Ansprüche aller Benutzer unmöglich befriedigt werden können” (p. vii). At the end of entries, the 18th edition adds references to text-critical issues included in commentaries, *BH* and *BHS* (see the examples below).

In matters of textual criticism, the otherwise very advanced *HW* lacked sophistication, a situation that has improved in the revisions of *HW*. Gesenius’ minimalist approach to textual sources should not be evaluated by reviewing the more advanced approach of the revisers of the *HW*; rather each scholar should be reviewed with regard to his own work. Throughout the years, lexicographers have become more open to textual criticism; however, it remains minimal even in 2010. The minimalist approach to text-critical issues in the *HW* and its revisions has been followed also by other lexicographers. The focus of lexicographical activity thus remained MT with the Tiberian vocalization.

The major lexicon used today, *HALOT*, went through a similar development to that of the *HW* with the growing inclusion of textual data in its various editions. Thus the introduction by Koehler and Baumgartner to the first edition of the Hebrew part of the Lexicon (1953) makes no mention of text-critical issues, but the third edition (1967–1996) mentions various types of inner-Masoretic variants and readings from *SP* and the Hexapla.²⁶ As an example of the attention given to *SP*, *HALOT*, in the entry *חָשַׁם*, mentions the Samaritan pronunciations *āšam/išem* in Gen 36:34, 35, together with *חֹשֶׁם* of 1 Chr 1:45–46. Important variant vocalizations of Hebrew words in the Samaritan tradition are registered in several entries, e.g. *אֶבְדָּה* (*SP ēbidḏa*), and *אֶרְנֹן/אֶרְנָן* (*SP ārēnan*). The lexicon also records deviating *LXX* vocalizations such as *גִּלְעָד*—Γαλααδ.²⁷ The editors of this modern tool criticized the multiple “emendations” (probably referring

26 “The textual base for OT vocabulary has been extended by including variant readings from the Oriental and Samaritan textual traditions as well as the Sirach fragments and the Biblical texts from Qumran.” It also added inner-Masoretic variants: “‘Oriental’ or ‘Babylonian’ textual variants have had to be added and are indicated by the siglum Or., ... see P. Kahle, *Der Masoretische Text des Alten Testaments nach der Überlieferung der Babylonischen Juden* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902; repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1966) and also the manuscripts collected under the siglum E in *Biblia Hebraica*³⁻⁷.” The editors further mention the nonbiblical Qumran manuscripts, and the transcriptions of the *Secunda* column of the Hexapla and of Jerome.

27 These examples are mentioned in Baumgarten’s foreword to the third edition.

to non-Masoretic readings and conjectures) suggested around the turn of the twentieth century, noting that improved linguistic insights into Ugaritic and other Semitic languages now make superfluous many a change in MT.²⁸

The introductions to the various volumes of Clines, *Dictionary* do not refer to text-critical issues, including the last volume published to date.²⁹ Thus the entry [הדור] (vol. II.490) described this word in Isa 45:2 (see below) as “mountainous land.” While it quotes 1QIsa^a הררים and 1QIsa^b הרורים, it nevertheless ascribes to הדורים the meaning of הררים.

Until the publication of BDB, the English-speaking world had been accustomed to the translations of the *HW* by Robinson (1854) and Tregelles (1859). However, Semitic studies had advanced since those publications, and the editors of BDB therefore prepared an updated translation, accepting conjectures, but recording only a small number of variants.

3 Lexicography: Practice

We now turn to some examples of variant readings that in our view ought to be recorded in lexicons. Gesenius disregards most textual evidence in *HW* and the *Thesaurus*, while later editions of *HW* sometimes incorporate such evidence.³⁰

The examples have been chosen from among the significant variants to MT discussed in my book *TCHB*. I submit that all these variants should be included in a lexicon of *biblical* Hebrew since they are as much exponents of the biblical text as MT. Some of these details warrant new entries, while others need to be mentioned in existing entries. Obviously, Gesenius and other lexicographers prior to 1947 could not have included the readings from the Qumran scrolls, but they could have included readings from the versions where they make a significant contribution to lexicography.

3.1 Variants That May be Preferable to Assumed Mistakes in MT

Isa 45:2a	MT Q	(אני לפניך אלך) וְהָדוּרִים אוֹשֵׁר אֶאֱיֹשֶׁר (I will go before you) and (I shall level) <i>hadurim</i> .
	1QIsa ^a	וְהָרִירִים, 1QIsa ^b וְהָרִירִים = LXX ὄρη καὶ ὄρη and mountains

28 See Tov, *TCHB*, 336–339.

29 Vol. VII (2007) until *samekh*.

30 In addition to Gesenius' first edition of the *HW* and his *Thesaurus*, we record the latest editions (ed. 14 and 18) of the *HW*, while disregarding the intermediate ones.

On the basis of contextual (cf. also 40:3–4) and linguistic considerations, the reading of 1QIsa^a LXX (= s) appears preferable. The prophet describes God's ability to accomplish the impossible (v. 2b: "I will shatter doors of bronze and cut down iron bars"), and in light of v. 2b, a reading "I will level the mountains" (1QIsa^a LXX) would be appropriate. When והררים was corrupted by a *daleth/resh* interchange, a *waw* was added as an internal vowel letter giving the resulting word והדורים (MT) the appearance of a passive participle.

The meaning of הדורים is debated among exegetes.³¹ In spite of its acceptance by ancient and modern exegetes and in modern Hebrew, many consider it to be a ghost entry. According to that view, the correct reading is the contextually acceptable הררים. Lexicographers could have accepted that entry on the basis of the LXX, supported in modern times by 1QIsa^a.^b However, often the variant has been disregarded when הדורים was given a new and questionable meaning:

Gesenius, *HW*, 1.219 basing himself on Schultens, connects הדורים with הדר and אדר assuming that the basic meaning of the root הדר II (represented only by הדורים) is "to swell" from which the meaning "honour" has been derived. According to *HW*, 1.13, this is also the base meaning of the root אדר ("aufschwellen"). Gesenius, *HW* quotes LXX not as reflecting a variant reading, but as an exegetical tradition disregarded in his lexicographical note.³² Likewise, *KJV*: "the crooked places"; *NEB*: "swelling hills." In the same vein, BDB 1907 explains the word as "swelling places" (the lexicon adds a question mark and says "si vera lectio"). Clines, *Dictionary*, 11.490 ascribes the meaning of the LXX ("mountainous land") to הדורים, a very questionable procedure.

Other tools disregard MT, focusing instead on the alternative reading. The 18th edition of the *HW*, 11.268 describes MT as a *Schreibfehler*, and accepts the reading of the LXX 1QIsa^a.³³ *HALOT*³ does not present this form under the root הדר, but as a separate entry הדורים, where MT is disregarded and the alternative

31 The root of a participle והדורים is not known from other places. *Faute de mieux*, the word is often connected with הדר, "glory" (cf. *gloriosos terrae*) and the root הדר and hence is explained by BDB s.v. as "swelling places" (cf. *NEB*: "swelling hills"). For a similar difference between MT and the LXX, see Mic 2:9 הדרי—הדרים. On the other hand, C.H. Southwood, "The Problematic *h'dûrîm* of Isaiah XLV 2," *VT* 25 (1975): 801–802 suggested that MT reflects an Akkadian loan word *dûru*, "city walls," which could fit the context.

32 In *Thesaurus*, 1.367, Gesenius explicitly mentions, but rejects, the possibility that LXX reflects a reading הררים, and in any event he does not evaluate the comparative value of the two readings.

33 The 14th edition of Gesenius–Buhl presents an intermediary stage between Gesenius' own view and the view later expressed in the 18th edition. That edition mentions the possibility that the LXX reflects הררים (p. 157).

form הַרְרִים is recorded: “cj. * הַרְרִים (Sept. הַר), and now 1QIs^a (Kutscher *Lang. Is.* 175).”³⁴ Likewise, some modern translations boldly accept the reading of 1QIs^a והַרְרִים = LXX: *RSV, NRSV*: “the mountains”; *NJPS*: “the hills that loom up.”³⁵

Isa 11:15	MT	והניף ידו על הנהר) בְּעִים רוחו (He will raise his hand over the Euphrates) with His ?? (<i>NJPS</i> : scorching) wind.
Emendation:		בְּעִצִּים רוחו with <i>the might of</i> His wind

The meaning of בְּעִים in MT is not clear.³⁶ Some scholars interpret it as “heat,” based on Arabic. Other scholars suggested reading בְּעִצִּים רוחו, “with the might of His wind,” instead of MT.³⁷ This emendation was first proposed by Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, 1017 (s. v. עִים)³⁸ and Luzzatto, *Isaia*, 165 on the basis of the similarity between *yod* and *sade* in the “early” Hebrew script. There is no lemma עִים or בְּעִים in Gesenius, *HW* 1, but there is one in Gesenius–Buhl, *HW* ed. 14, p. 529. BDB, p. 744 and Clines, *Dictionary*, VI.355 hesitate between בְּעִים, “glow” and a conjecture בְּעִצִּים. *HALOT* mentions these possibilities, preferring the conjecture.

1 Sam 1:24	MT	בַּפְּרִים שְׁלָשָׁה = בַּפְּרִים שְׁלָשָׁה (= v T) (And when she had weaned him, she took him up with her,) along with <i>three bulls</i> , (an ephah of flour).
------------	----	--

34 In a tool written in 2000 or even 1967, the formulation “and now” is misleading. Further, *הַרְרִים is not a conjecture, but a preferred reading based on three sources.

35 Does this translation somehow try to reflect both הַרְרִים and הַדְּרִים?

36 Luzzatto, *Isaia*, 165: “a word which has no equivalent and no clear meaning in the other languages.”

37 Cf. H. Wildberger, *Jesaja* (BK X/1; Neukirchen/Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1980), 464. On the other hand, possibly this reading was already reflected in the LXX (πνεύματος βία, “with a strong wind”), and באִזְרֵהוּ דְרוּחָהּ (“with the force of His wind”) = *in fortitudine spiritus sui*. If the ancient translations indeed read בְּעִצִּים, we are faced with an early reading not requiring any emendation. By the same token, if the word is interpreted as reflecting a meaning now lost, it need not be emended. E. Eshel, “Isaiah 11:15: A New Interpretation Based on the Genesis Apocryphon,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 38–45 explained MT as referring to the Euphrates, further developed by A. Demsky, “B’ym (Isa 11:15) = (Bit)Bahiān: Resolving an Ancient Crux,” *DSD* 16 (2008): 248–252.

38 Although Gesenius mentions the ancient versions, he presents this case as a conjecture.

LXX	ἐν μὲν ἄλλῃ τριετίῳ בפרמשלש = בפר מְשִׁלֵּשׁ (= s) along with a <i>three-year-old bull</i>
4QSam ^a	בפר בן בקר משלש [along with (a)] <i>three-year-old bull</i>

Probably the readings of MT and LXX 4QSam^a derived from a common source: בפרמשלש. According to the context, it is reasonable to assume that this word cluster originally referred to a פר, “bull,” in the singular,³⁹ i.e., “she took him up ... along with a three-year-old bull.” When that word cluster was divided into two separate words, the common source of LXX 4QSam^a retained this understanding (בפר משלש), while MT erroneously divided the words as בפרמשלש, referring to three bulls. At that point, the scribe added *matres lectionis* in MT in accordance with the understanding of these words as referring to “bulls three”: a *yod* in the first word and a *he* at the end of the second one. At the same time, the non-final *mem* was transformed into a final letter.

On the basis of the LXX and 4QSam^a, an entry משלש (בפר) may be suggested for any lexicon.⁴⁰ However, this occurrence is not mentioned in Gesenius, *HW*, II.1158 (the same word in MT Gen 15:9 is mentioned), nor in *Thesaurus*, III.1427–1428 or Gesenius–Buhl, *HW* ed. 14, p. 766, but it is in BDB, p. 1026 and *HALOT* as a “conjecture” without reference to either LXX or 4QSam^a.

3.2 Variants That May be Equally as Valid as MT

1Sam 20:30	MT	בן נָעוּת הַמְרִדוֹת son of a perverse, rebellious woman (<i>RSV</i> , <i>NRSV</i> , <i>NJPS</i>)
	LXX	υἱὲ κορασίων ἀπομολούντων son of deserting maidens
	= ? 4QSam ^b	בן נערות המרדת

In our view, the reading of MT is as difficult as that of LXX 4QSam^b. The reading of MT is linguistically difficult since נָעוּת and הַמְרִדוֹת seem to express the same idea (crooked in respect of rebelliousness).⁴¹ The reading(s) of the LXX and 4QSam^b is (are) difficult in other ways. According to the LXX, Jonathan is a

39 In the following verse, the bull is referred to in the singular in all the textual witnesses (“Then they slew *the bull*”).

40 Thus Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis*, 41; Driver, *Samuel*, 20.

41 Thus Driver, *Samuel*, 170.

son of more than one maiden, which is impossible. 4QSam^b seems to reflect the same reading (המרדת is twice defective).⁴² Either of these two readings (or possibly a third one)⁴³ could reflect the original text.

Gesenius, *HW*, 11.835 and *Thesaurus*, 11.999, *HALOT* (“bastard of a wayward woman”), and Clines, *Dictionary*, VI.295 record the above-mentioned reading of MT without even mentioning LXX (or 4QSam^b). On the other hand, Gesenius–Buhl, *HW*, ed. 14, p. 518 mentions LXX נערוֹת. BDB prefers that variant (see n. 43).

Gen 47:21	MT	וְאֵת הָעָם הָעֶבְרִי אֲתוֹ לְעָרִים (= T ^{OJN} ; ≈ S) And as for the population, he <i>transferred</i> them to the cities (?).
	SP	וְאֵת הָעָם הָעֶבְרִי אֲתוֹ לְעִבְדִּים (= LXX; ≈ S) And as for the population, he <i>enslaved</i> them to servitude.

The reading of SP is not mentioned by Gesenius, *HW*, 11.815; *Thesaurus*, 11.978; Gesenius–Buhl, *HW* ed. 14, p. 505. It is mentioned by Clines, *Dictionary*, VI.214 and in *HALOT* where it is named a “conjectural reading” without further details. BDB, 713 mentions this reading without indicating that this is the reading of SP, but the full analysis is found under העביר. The reading of SP may well be preferable (cf. vv. 19, 23) and therefore deserves attention.

Gen 49:7	MT	אָרֹר אֲפָם (= T ^{OJFN} LXX V S) <i>cursed</i> be their anger
	SP	אָדִיר אֲפָם <i>mighty</i> was their anger

The reading of SP was extensively discussed by Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, 1.28. It is not mentioned in Gesenius, *HW* ed. 18, 1.14; Gesenius–Buhl, *HW* ed. 14, p. 9; BDB; *HALOT*; Clines, *Dictionary*, 1.123.

Mount Gerizim, הרגריזים, *hrgryzym*, is written as one word in SP. Gesenius, *HW*, 1.239; *HW* ed. 18, 1.284; Gesenius–Buhl, *HW* ed. 14, p. 168; BDB, 250–251; and Clines, *Dictionary*, 1.584 do not record this spelling. On the other hand, *HALOT* provides the relevant information under “Gerizim.”

42 This defective spelling is not unusual for this scroll; see *TCHB*, 211.

43 Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis*, 119; Driver, *Samuel*, 171; BDB, 730 prefer נערת המרדות in the singular.

Num 24:17	MT	וקרקר כל בני שת (= LXX) the <i>foundation</i> (?) of all the children of Seth
	SP	וקדקד כל בני שת (Jer 48:45 MT T V S) the <i>pate</i> of all the children of Seth

BDB, 869 prefers קדקד of SP (without mentioning that version) to MT קרקר. HALOT likewise prefers this word named here as a conjecture. The reading of SP is not mentioned in Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, 1192; HW, 11.993; Gesenius–Buhl, HW ed. 14, p. 640.

3.3 Variants That Add Significant Lexicographical Data to the Recording of MT

Isa 47:2	MT	גלי צמתך חשפי שבל גלי שוק remove your veil, strip off your <i>train</i> , uncover your leg
	1QIsa ^a	חשופי שוליד

שבל is a *hapax legomenon* in the Bible and is not used in rabbinic Hebrew. On the other hand, שוליד occurs frequently in similar contexts (Jer 13:22, 26; Lam 1:9; Nah 3:5). For the phrase, cf. especially Jer 13:26. Among the modern lexicons, this occurrence is not recorded in HALOT.

Isa 7:25	MT	שמיר ושית (= LXX) thorn bush and thistle
	1QIsa ^a	ברזל שמיר ושית iron thorn bush and thistle (interlinear addition above שמיר).

The gloss in 1QIsa^a explains a word in the text.⁴⁴ Among the modern lexicons, this word is not recorded in HALOT.

Gen 14:14	MT	וירק את חניכיו he <i>armed</i> (?) his followers
	SP	וידק את חניכיו he <i>crushed</i> (?) his followers

44 In the spoken language of the Second Temple period, שמיר had a secondary meaning of “iron,” to which the glossator probably referred. Relevant material was collected by S. Lieberman, “Forgotten Meanings,” *Leshonenu* 32 (1967–1968): 99–102 (Heb.); E. Qimron, “Textual Remarks on 1QIs^a,” *Textus* 12 (1985) ט—ס (Heb. with Eng. summ.).

The reading of SP is not mentioned in Gesenius, *HW*, 1.206; *Thesaurus*, 1.348; Gesenius–Buhl, *HW* ed. 14, p. 150; BDB, 200; *HALOT* s. v. נָזִיר; Clines, *Dictionary*. On the other hand, Gesenius–Meyer, *HW* ed. 18, 11.257 refers the reader to the entry נָזִיר for this reading.

The *nazir* occurs sixteen times in Hebrew Scripture. A modern dictionary should also mention the additional occurrence of this word in 1Sam 1:22 in 4QSam^a. Samuel is a *nazir* but this word is used for him only in 4QSam^a. Among the modern lexicons, this occurrence is not recorded in Clines, *Dictionary*, v.649 and *HALOT*.

Conclusions

1. As a careful lexicographer, Gesenius felt that the time was neither ripe for recording details culled from LXX nor for adding conjectures. He therefore decided to record mainly MT, leaving the task of textual decisions to specialists, while in minor decisions of inner-Masoretic variants he suggested that the lexicographer should take the task of a textual critic upon himself. In his *HW*, he accordingly disregarded the textual evidence, leaving this for his later *Thesaurus*. However, when writing these thoughts in 1810 Gesenius did not know that when the *Thesaurus* was finally published (1829–1858) it would actually only rarely contain such material.
2. In the generations following Gesenius, increasingly more textual variants were included in the revisions of the *HW* up until 2009, as well as in other lexicons (BDB, *HALOT*, Clines), again inconsistently and sparingly. I have come across only one theoretical statement by lexicographers regarding their approach towards textual matters.⁴⁵
3. If the purpose of a biblical lexicon is to record the content of MT, the existing lexicons perform that task. In that case, the lexicons of the Old Testament should be renamed as “lexicons of the Hebrew Bible according to MT.” Such a lexicon would be acceptable as a lexicographical recording of a corpus. How-

45 J. Barr, “Hebrew Lexicography: Informal Thoughts,” in *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew* (ed. W.R. Bodine; Winona Lake, IN, 1992), 137–151 briefly discusses the textual basis of the lexicon (not the “original” meaning, according to Barr) and the inclusion of “emendations” (under this heading Barr suggests to include emendations and “corrections” on the basis of the LXX). In his planned *Oxford Hebrew Lexicon* (which was discontinued) Barr expected to include a full analysis of these issues in the preface.

ever, according to modern trends in textual criticism, MT is only one of the textual sources of Hebrew Scripture that need to be taken into consideration in the lexicographical description of Hebrew Scripture. Lexicographers cannot examine all sources, but whatever system is chosen, in my view they should cover either all or none of the non-Masoretic textual sources. The extant lexicons are inconsistent in their practices and contain no clear statement on the procedures followed.

4. If the lexicographer decides to record variants beyond MT, the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls contain several relevant readings. The Qumran scrolls yield some fifty new entries or new meanings that need to be incorporated into a biblical lexicon, e.g.⁴⁶

4QCant^a 4:3 מזקנה, “chin”? (MT רקתך)

4QCant^b 4:8 אומנון, Omnon, a by-form of אמונה MT

4QCant^b 2:14 מדלגה “rocky step” (MT מדרגה)

An examination of the SP likewise yields a number of new entries.⁴⁷ In the case of the LXX, a definition needs to be made of what constitutes relevant new information. Deviations from MT reflecting variant Hebrew readings are often relevant, as described above. However, it is unclear whether lexicographical traditions need to be recorded in a lexicon of the Hebrew text.⁴⁸

5. Practical aspects should be taken into consideration. The preparation of a comprehensive biblical lexicon, as suggested above, is problematic since the recording of elements from SP and the Judean Desert scrolls would necessarily

46 The examination is based on a comparison of the module of the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls (M.G. Abegg) and that of *BHS* within the *Accordance* program. Thanks are due to Prof. M.G. Abegg and to Drs. R. and H. Brown of *Accordance* for advice. For relevant data from the nonbiblical Qumran scrolls, see E. Qimron, “The Biblical Lexicon in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 2 (1995): 295–329.

47 The system used is the same as that described in the previous note. The module of SP in *Accordance* is based on Tal’s edition and includes the Samaritan reading tradition.

48 For example, the tradition that קשיטה (“an ancient weight used as money” [HALOT]) is rendered by ἀμνός and ἀμνάς (“lamb”) in the LXX (Gen 33:19; Jos 24:32; Job 42:11) may or may not be relevant for a Hebrew lexicon. Likewise, the LXX reflects many a translation equivalent based on post-biblical Hebrew. For an analysis, see J. Joosten, “The Knowledge and Use of Hebrew in the Hellenistic Period: Qumran and the Septuagint,” in *Diggers at the Well*, 115–130.

involve the inclusion of many late elements. It may therefore be necessary to be selective regarding these sources, but in that case the principles need to be stated clearly. Alternatively, all variants should be excluded, and only the corpus of MT should be recorded, based on a corpus linguistic approach, with the possible correction of corrupt readings in MT.

Textual Criticism of Hebrew Scripture and Scripture-Like Texts

When utilizing ancient sources in the textual criticism of Hebrew Scripture, we use different types of materials, not only those that pertain directly to Hebrew Scripture, but also those that are included in Scripture-like compositions. The latter group, consisting of a few subgroups, contains compositions that have the appearance of Scripture, but were not meant to be such. In this definition, Scripture refers to a collection of authoritative scrolls that one could study, from which one could quote and read in religious gatherings, and that formed the basis for religious practice.

The procedure of textual criticism involves the collecting of differences between the textual sources, named variant readings or variants.¹ In our system, as in that of most scholars, all details in manuscripts are considered readings, while readings differing from MT are named variants. These variants are found in many types of sources, and the present study focuses on variants found in Scripture-like compositions and commentaries.

The analysis starts with compositions that can easily be confused with Scripture, that is: (1) liturgical texts, and (2) rewritten Scripture compositions. A third group is usually not confused with Scripture, viz., commentaries (3), although in fact fragments of such commentaries have sometimes been confused with Scripture.

Liturgical texts (1) have the appearance of Scripture texts, and they even carry names of biblical books, such as 11QPs^a, 4QPs^a, etc. In my view, these names are misleading, but others think they are appropriate (see below).

Rewritten Scripture compositions (2) are a little further removed from Scripture, but in the publication history of these texts, the two categories were sometimes confused. For example, some fragments of the Temple Scroll were initially identified as biblical texts: 11QT^b XI 21–24 was first described as 11QDeut (Deut 13:7–11) by van der Ploeg,² but later identified as part of 11QT^b by van der

1 Some scholars use the term “variants” in the same neutral way that we use the term “readings.” For example, B.F. Westcott & F.J.A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (vols. I–II; 2nd ed.; London/New York: Macmillan, 1896), II.3.

2 J.P.M. van der Ploeg, “Les manuscrits de la grotte XI de Qumran,” *RevQ* 12 (1985–1987): 3–15 (1985–1987): 9–10.

Woude³ and García Martínez.⁴ The most characteristic example of a confusion of the two categories is that of the five manuscripts of 4QRP which were published as rewritten Scripture, but are now taken by many as Scripture itself.⁵

A lack of clarity also remains concerning the relation between some Scripture and *peshet* fragments (3).⁶

Equally problematic, though in a different way, is the description of the SP and pre-Samaritan texts. Usually they are portrayed as Scripture, but sometimes as rewritten Scripture. The latter would be wrong, since SP is firmly based as the Scripture of the Samaritan community. Its text indeed uses practices that are also used in the rewritten Scripture compositions, but this fact does not affect its status as Scripture.

The focus of this study is the contribution of the Scripture-like compositions and commentaries to textual criticism. Scripture-like scrolls are problematic in the text-critical procedure, as they reflect both variants similar to those included in ancient Scripture texts, and variations on a large scale, for example, the different sequence of the Psalms in the liturgical Qumran Psalters. Our working hypothesis is that major deviations from MT in these Scripture-like texts are irrelevant to textual criticism, since they are found in compositions that are not classified as authoritative Scripture. However, the analysis is complicated by the fact that scholars disagree regarding the nature of all the texts discussed below. Texts that we consider Scripture-like are considered Scripture by others.

1 Liturgical Texts

Liturgical works are texts used in the religious service by a community or individuals. They can be read aloud or silently, as in the case of Psalms, or they are used in religious practice as in the case of the *tefillin* and *mezuzot*.

3 A.S. van der Woude, "Ein bisher unveröffentlichtes Fragment der Tempelrolle," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 89–92.

4 García Martínez, "11QTemple^b: A Preliminary Publication," in: *Madrid Qumran Congress*, 363–391.

5 See chapters 1 and 4 in this volume.

6 The text that has been published as 4QpapIsa^p(4Q69) contains only a few words, and therefore could have represented a *peshet* like 4Qpap pIsa^c. This possibility is strengthened by the fact that papyrus texts of biblical books are extremely rare among the Qumran texts. 4Q168 is presented in all lists as 4QpMic?, but it could be presented equally well as 4QMic?

1. *Ketef Hinnom amulets*. Scholars agree regarding the liturgical nature of the two minute silver rolls, dating to the 7th or 6th century BCE found at Ketef Hinnom in Jerusalem. These rolls, containing the priestly blessing (Num 6:24–26), are generally taken as liturgical texts of some sort. Therefore, their differences from MT may not be relevant to the text-critical analysis of the biblical text.⁷ The indication of these minuses in a textual apparatus of Numbers would be misleading since these silver rolls probably contained a free version of the priestly blessing for personal use.
2. *Pap. Nash*, dating to the 1st or 2nd century BCE, contains the Decalogue (Exod 20:2–17 = Deut 5:6–21) followed by the introductory formula Deut 4:45 and the *shema* pericope (Deut 6:4–5 are preserved).⁸ The Nash Deuteronomy papyrus sheds some light on several small details in the textual transmission of that book, but large differences reflect free rewriting.
3. *Liturgical texts from Qumran*. “Prayer played a major role in the life of the Qumran community. In the wake of the sect’s succession from the Jerusalem Temple, prayer served as a substitute for sacrifice. It was considered the preferred means of worship and instrument for atonement as long as the Temple service was conducted in impurity.”⁹ Many liturgical works were authored for this purpose¹⁰ as: (1) collections of daily prayers (e.g. 4QDibre Hame’orot); (2) collections concerned with various festivals (e.g. 4QprFêtes); (3) collections concerned with the Sabbath sacrifice (*Shirot Olat Hashabat*); (4) collections and texts concerned with covenantal ceremonies (e.g. 4QBerakhot); and (5) rituals of purification (e.g. 4QPurification Liturgy).¹¹ All these texts make abundant use of biblical language, while the terminology of the later Jewish liturgy is also recognizable in them.

In addition, segments of the Torah and Psalms have been combined into collections, altered somewhat to suit their use in liturgy.¹² For the liturgy, these changes, such as the juxtaposition of Psalms that are not adjacent in the MT-Psalter and the addition of new ones, are not unusual. However, if these features

7 See *TCHB*, 111.

8 See *TCHB*, 111.

9 E.G. Chazon, “Psalms, Hymns, and Prayers,” in: *Encyclopedia DSS*, 712.

10 This summary reflects the presentation in D.W. Parry and E. Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Volumes 1–2* (2nd edition, revised and expanded; Leiden: Brill, 2014).

11 Most of these texts were published in *DJD* VII and XI.

12 Since the argument of liturgical scrolls is not without doubts, it is also possible that these scrolls were prepared for personal use.

were taken as representing authoritative Scripture collections, they would be dramatically significant for textual and literary criticism.

It is not impossible that the names assigned to these Torah and Psalms fragments may have been considered provisional when first given, but over time they have become definitive, engendering the view held by most scholars that these are Scripture scrolls.¹³

The next paragraphs are devoted to the implications of these liturgical texts for textual criticism.

a. *Liturgical Torah Scrolls (or Personal Copies)*. Several Torah scrolls are described as liturgical. The best examples of the liturgical use of Scripture sections are the *tefillin* and *mezuzot*.¹⁴ In addition, a number of “Scripture” texts from the Judean Desert contain only segments of chapters that are included in the *tefillin* and *mezuzot*, as well as Deuteronomy 8,¹⁵ and are therefore often described as liturgical.¹⁶ The argument for their liturgical use is supported by the small size of several scrolls,¹⁷ precluding the possibility that they contained the complete biblical books. In the Torah, we can easily posit an opposition between liturgical and other scrolls, while in the Qumran Psalms there is no visible opposition between the presumed liturgical scrolls and a Qumran MT Psalter. Presumably the Qumran community accepted such a Psalter, identical or similar to MT, as authoritative,¹⁸ but such copies have not been found at Qumran or are very

13 For the “official” names, see Tov, *Revised Lists*.

14 The Scripture chapters from which excerpts are included in the Qumran copies of these *tefillin* and *mezuzot* are: Exodus 12, 13 and Deuteronomy 5, 6, 10, 11, 32. See Tov, *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 30–32. The *tefillin* and *mezuzot* are not regular biblical texts despite consisting of Torah passages separated by a *vacat* in the middle of the line or a blank line. The range of textual variation in these texts reflects the known variants between biblical manuscripts, and is not specific to these excerpted texts. At the same time, the juxtaposition of these texts is not used in text-critical analyses, and is not noted in textual apparatuses.

15 The assumption of liturgical use is based on an argument of silence, as other fragments of these scrolls may have been lost, an assumption that is rather unlikely for all these scrolls. Furthermore, in no case has a join between chapters been preserved in the scrolls mentioned below.

16 For references to the liturgical use of some texts, see J. Duncan, *DJD* XIV, 79 and M. Weinfeld, “Grace after Meals,” *JBL* 111 (1992): 427–440.

17 4QDeut^f: 14 lines; 4QDeut^b: 12–14 lines; 4QDeut^g: 11 lines; 4QPs^g: 8 lines.

18 The authors of the *pesharim* considered the biblical scrolls of the Prophets and the Psalms authoritative (see below). Further, the Psalms are quoted in various sectarian writings (see a list in Flint, *Psalms*, 220), introduced by the formula אֲשֶׁר אָמַר דָּוִד in 4QCatena A (4Q177) 12–13 I 2.

rare. The liturgical use of these scrolls would have included devotional reading from these chapters, as included in the following scrolls:

- 4QDeutⁱ, containing sections from Deuteronomy 5, 8, 10, 11, 32 and Exodus 12, 13;
- 4QDeut^{k1}, containing sections from Deuteronomy 5, 11, 32;
- 4QDeutⁿ, covering Deuteronomy 8, 5 (in that sequence);
- 4QDeut^q, probably covering only Deuteronomy 32.¹⁹

b. *Liturgical Psalm Scrolls (or Personal Copies)*. Among the liturgical Psalms scrolls, three texts contain only the long acrostic Psalm 119: 4QPs^g, 4QPs^h, 5QPs. It can be no coincidence that this Psalm, which has played an important role in Jewish liturgy and that of the Orthodox Church to this day, was transmitted in separate scrolls already in Qumran times, probably for liturgical purposes.

A relatively large group of additional psalm scrolls from Qumran, including both canonical and “apocryphal” psalms, may be considered liturgical. At least five groups of scrolls and individual scrolls²⁰ differ from the MT and LXX Psalters in both the addition of non-canonical psalms and the omission and altered sequence of the canonical Psalms²¹ (for details on all these, see Flint and Lange).²² Several scholars present these Psalms scrolls as biblical texts,²³ and in their opinion they present a very different picture of the biblical Psalter,²⁴

19 For the textual critic, this scroll contains very important readings, because it was copied from a very good copy of that book. See *TCHB*, 249.

20 Due to their fragmentary condition, not all the 36 Qumran scrolls can be ascribed to one of the five groups.

21 See *TCHB*, 320–321.

22 Flint, *Psalms*; Lange, *Handbuch*, 415–450.

23 The position of J.A. Sanders was formulated with regard to 11QPs^a, which he published in *DJD* IV (1965), but he also referred to the cave 4 Psalms scrolls in Sanders 1974, 98. Flint, *Psalms* dealt extensively with the Psalms scrolls from all the caves. It is unclear whether any of the Qumran Psalms scrolls unequivocally supports the sequence of the MT-Psalter against these Qumran collections (see Flint, *Psalms*, 158).

24 Like Sanders and G.H. Wilson, “The Qumran *Psalms Scroll* (11QPs^a) and the Canonical Psalter,” *CBQ* 59 (1997): 448–464 at an earlier stage of scholarship, Flint *Psalms* suggested that books 1–3 (Psalms 1–89) of the collection of Psalms were finalized before books 4–5 (Psalms 90–150) and that the major differences among the various Qumran Psalm collections reflect different crystallizations of the Psalter. According to Sanders and Wilson, a comparison of MT and 11QPs^a shows that alternative collections of Psalms circulated before the 1st century CE.

especially Flint in an extensive study.²⁵ However, the view held by other scholars that these scrolls are liturgical, and therefore irrelevant to the analysis of authoritative Scripture scrolls, is preferable.²⁶ The arguments used in favor of that position pertain especially to the longest scroll, 11QPs^a.²⁷ The inclusion in col. xxvii of “David’s Last Words” (2 Sam 23:[1–]7) and of the sectarian prose composition listing David’s compositions precludes the characterization of that scroll as a scriptural Psalms scroll. Other scholars, especially Wacholder and Dahmen, likewise deny the scriptural character of 11QPs^a by emphasizing its eschatological and Davidic character.²⁸

1.1 *Textual Implications*

Liturgical scrolls were used for devotional reading in religious service. Although they contained Scripture texts, the Qumran covenanters would not have considered them adequate for their Bible study or as a source for scriptural quotations. The free approach towards the content of these scrolls comes to light in the addition of the prose composition in 11QPs^a xxvii and of many non-canonical psalms. These scrolls should not be used in canonical and literary criticism of Hebrew Scripture,²⁹ while their small deviations from MT are con-

25 This view is reflected not only in Flint, *Psalms*, but also in the publications in *DJD* xvi and in Ulrich, *BQS* with a detailed notation of the deviations of the Psalms scrolls from MT. This view is also reflected in E. Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions: Reflections toward a Theory of the History of the Biblical Text,” in idem, *DSS*, 99–120 (115–120).

26 See n. 11 in chapter 4 in this volume.

27 (1) The added antiphonal refrains to Psalm 145 in col. xvi; (2) more in general, cols. xv–xvii represent a separate liturgical collection; (3) col. 11 1–5 probably represents a hymn based on Psalm 146:9–10 and other Psalms; (4) the addition of the extra-canonical hymns “Plea for Deliverance” (col. xix), “Apostrophe to Zion” (col. xxii), and the “Hymn to the Creator” (col. xxvi); (5) the inclusion of the complete text of Psalm 119 points to the scroll’s liturgical character because of the prominent place of that Psalm in the liturgy (see above).

28 B.Z. Wacholder, “David’s Eschatological Psalter 11Q Psalms^a,” *HUCA* 59 (1988): 23–72; U. Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPs^a aus Qumran* (STDJ 49; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 313–318 (Dahmen considers this scroll a manual, based on MT, containing psalms to be used by the future Davidic Messiah); M. Kleer, “Der liebliche Sänger der Psalmen Israels,” *BBB* 108 (1996): 204–317; Wilson, “Psalms Scroll”; Lange, *Handbuch*, 443.

29 Thus also Dahmen *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 314, referring to 11QPs^a. If the large deviations from MT in the Qumran Psalms scrolls are taken as authoritative Scripture, they would have to be recorded in the critical apparatuses of Scripture editions, as was indeed done by Ulrich, *BQS*, see below.

stantly used in text-critical analysis. These scrolls thus provide no reliable information about the growth of the biblical book of Psalms, just as the liturgical Torah scrolls are irrelevant for the literary analysis of the Torah.

In our view, the large deviations from MT in these liturgical scrolls should not be applied to biblical criticism, textual or literary, since they were written for different purposes. If they were to be used for those purposes, the implications for biblical criticism would be far-reaching:

1. Several non-canonical Psalms would have to be considered scriptural, such as the so-called *Apostrophe to Zion*.³⁰
2. The prose composition in 11QPs^a XXVII ("David's Compositions") would have to be included in a "variant edition" of the scriptural book of Psalms.³¹
3. The unusual sequences of Psalms and their omission (e.g. Psalm 32 in 4QPs^a and 4QPs^q) should be indicated in a critical apparatus of the Scripture text,³² although they may have appeared elsewhere in the Qumran Psalter.

2 Rewritten Scripture Compositions

A typical group of Scripture-like compositions are the so-called rewritten Scripture texts. Authoritative status is not a sufficiently good criterion for the distinction between Scripture-like compositions and Scripture texts, since some rewritten Scripture texts themselves obtained authoritative status.

While many exegetical elements were inserted in authoritative Scripture copies in the course of their rewriting and transmission, a group of closely related rewritten Scripture texts, *non-biblical* texts,³³ were likewise changed

30 As a logical consequence of his views, Ulrich, *BQS* at the end of the first section of Psalms (all the Psalms scrolls except for 11QPs^a), records the *Apostrophe to Judah*, *Apostrophe to Zion*, *Eschatological Hymn*, *Plea of Deliverance*, in alphabetical sequence (pp. 691–693). Likewise, somewhat inconsistently, among the Psalms of 11QPs^a, and not as an appendix, this volume includes the *Apostrophe of Zion*, the *Plea for Deliverance*, the so-called *Syriac Psalms*, and even the prose composition in col. XXVII named "David's Compositions" (pp. 694–726).

31 This was indeed done by Ulrich, *BQS*, 725.

32 This was done by Ulrich, *BQS*, 636 in the heading of the Psalms, e.g. 31:23–25→33:1–12 in 4QPs^a; likewise, 31:24–25→33:1–18 in 4QPs^q; 38:16–23→71:1–14 in 4QPs^a, etc.

33 4–11QTemple, Jubilees, Enoch, as well as smaller compositions: Apocryphon of Moses, Apocryphon of Joshua, 4QVisSam (4Q160), 4QpsEzek^{a–e} (4Q385, 386, 385b, 388, 391),

away from the earlier text.³⁴ The two groups differ in their authoritative status, while both inserted changes in their underlying texts. Editors–scribes of biblical manuscripts such as the SP group, the *Vorlage* of the LXX in 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel and MT-Jeremiah inserted major and minor changes in the text, all of which were included in the authoritative Scripture texts that were circulated in ancient Israel.³⁵ Similar changes, often far more encompassing, were embedded in rewritten Scripture texts. As we shall see below, the large changes of this type are not relevant for the textual criticism of Hebrew Scripture since these works represent new compositions and not Scripture texts. Moreover, they did not serve as authoritative Scripture texts in later periods, with the exception of Jubilees and Enoch, considered authoritative in the Ethiopian Church. At the same time, these texts reflect several ancient variants in small details that are taken into consideration in textual analysis.

The boundary between the two types of texts is not easy to determine, as is shown vividly by 4QRP, published in *DJD XIII* as a rewritten Scripture text, and now considered by some a greatly deviating Bible text.³⁶

In my view, text-critical editions should not record the large deviations in these rewritten Scripture texts nor many of the small differences. However, this issue is complicated because many small details may be connected to a larger rewriting pattern. We focus on two central texts.

2.1 4-*nQT* Temple

An analysis of the reworking of *nQT*^a, probably considered authoritative at Qumran, is meant to illustrate the complexity of the text-critical use of that composition.³⁷

4QPrayer of Enosh (4Q369 [4QPrayer Concerning God and Israel?]), included in the *DSSR*, vol. 3A (Rewritten Bible).

34 See Crawford, *Rewriting*; G.J. Brooke, “Rewritten Bible,” in: *Encyclopedia DSS*, 2:777–781; M. Segal, “Between Bible and Rewritten Bible,” in: *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2005), 10–29; D.K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 8. London/New York: T&T Clark, 2007); M.M. Zahn, “Rewritten Scripture,” in: *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 323–336 (326–329).

35 See *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 283–305.

36 See chapters 1 and 4 in this volume.

37 *nQT*^a considered itself authoritative; see L 7, 17; LIV 5–7; LVI 20–21. See J.J. Collins, “Chang-

From col. LI 11 onwards, 11QT^a adduces large sections of Deut 16:18 and the next verses and chapters, together with other laws from the Torah, arranged mainly according to the chapter sequence in Deuteronomy, but also organized topically within that arrangement. This arrangement involves several digressions, such as the inclusion of Deuteronomy 12, against the sequence of the chapters, in col. LIII 1 ff. In the course of this rearrangement, we notice the following major “changes” of the biblical text used by the author of 11QT^a.

- a. 11QT^a systematically changed the third person references to God to the first person, although a few instances were forgotten (e.g. LXI 3 = Deut 18:21 [2×]), and in other cases he omitted the divine name altogether (e.g. LIII 11 = Deut 23:22).
- b. 11QT^a often changed *weqatal* forms to *wayiqtol* (e.g. XVI 3 = Exod 29:21; XVI 16 = Exod 29:12).
- c. 11QT^a changed כִּי at the beginning of laws to אֲם (8×) (e.g. LII 9; LIII 12).
- d. 11QT^a combined Scripture passages (e.g. LII 1–3: Deut 16:21–22 + Lev 26:1; LII 3–4: Deut 17:1 + 15:21).

Special attention should be paid to harmonizing additions in 11QT^a. For example, Deut 13:1 (LIV 5–6) was harmonized to Deut 12:28; Deut 13:15 (LV 6) was harmonized to Deut 17:4; Deut 17:4 (LV 19) was harmonized to Deut 13:15.

These changes can be illustrated best in running texts. Thus, the regulation of the centralization of the cult is adduced twice in chapter 12 (12:15–19; 12:20–28), but only once in 11QT^a LIII 2–8, rephrasing the second formulation (Deut 12:20–28).³⁸ That segment incorporates a phrase from the first formulation of the centralization regulation לְכָה אִתָּךְ אֲשֶׁר לִכָּה (LIII 3–4), parallel to Deut 12:21 לֵךְ יְהוָה נָתַן אֲשֶׁר נָתַן יְהוָה לְךָ, but derived from the first introduction in Deut 12:15. In the following presentation, the quantitative differences are shown by the arrangement in two columns.

ing Scripture,” in: *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period* (ed. H. von Weissenberg et al.; BZAW 419; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 39. Note also the *deluxe* format of this scroll, on which see *Scribal Practices*, 125–129.

38 See *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 17–20.

11QT ^a LIII 2–8	MT Deut 12:20–28
כי א[וְתָה נִפְשָׁכָה לֹאכֹל בִּשְׂרֵךְ בְּכֹל אוֹת נִפְשָׁכָה] תֹּאכַל בִּשְׂרֵךְ	20 כי תֹאווּ נֶפֶשׁ לֹאכֹל בָּשָׂר בְּכָל אוֹת נֶפֶשׁ תֹּאכַל בָּשָׂר
וּז[וֹ]בַחַת מִבְּקֶרֶךְ וּמִצָּאֵנָה כִּבְרַכְתִּי אֲשֶׁר אֵתָן לָכָה	21 כי יִרְחַק מִמֶּךָ הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יִבְחָר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְשׁוֹם שְׁמוֹ שָׁם וּזְבַחַת מִבְּקֶרֶךְ וּמִצָּאֵנָה אֲשֶׁר נָתַן יְהוָה לְךָ כֹּאֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתָךְ וְאָכַלְתָּ בִשְׂעִירֶיךָ בְּכָל אוֹת נֶפֶשׁ
וְאָכַלְתָּה בִשְׂעִירֶיךָ	22 אֲךָ כֹּאֲשֶׁר יֹאכַל אֶת הַצִּבִּי וְאֶת הָאֵיל כֵּן תֹּאכַלְנָה
וְהִטְהוֹר וְהִטְמֵא בְּכָה יִחֲדִיו כְּצִי וְכֹאֵיל רַק חֹזֶק לְבַלְתִּי אֹכֹל הַדָּם כִּי הַדָּם הוּא הַנֶּפֶשׁ וְלֹא תֹאכַל אֶת הַנֶּפֶשׁ עִם הַבָּשָׂר	הִטְמֵא וְהִטְהוֹר יִחֲדוּ יֹאכַלְנָה רַק חֹזֶק לְבַלְתִּי אֹכֹל הַדָּם כִּי הַדָּם הוּא הַנֶּפֶשׁ וְלֹא תֹאכַל הַנֶּפֶשׁ עִם הַבָּשָׂר לֹא תֹאכַלְנָה
עַל הָאָרֶץ תִּשְׁוֹפְכֶנָה כְּמִים וְכִסִּיתָהּ בַּעֲפָר (Lev 17:13)	24 עַל הָאָרֶץ תִּשְׁפֹּכֶנָה כְּמִים לֹא תֹאכַלְנָה
לִמְעַן יִיטֵב לָכָה וּלְבִנִּיכָה אַחֲרֶיכָה עַד עוֹלָם וַעֲשִׂיתָה הַיָּשָׁר וְהַטוֹב לִפְנֵי אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיכָה	25 לִמְעַן יִיטֵב לְךָ וּלְבִנֶיךָ אַחֲרֶיךָ כִּי תַעֲשֶׂה הַיָּשָׁר בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה

11QT^a succeeded very well in condensing and omitting many of the repetitions in the biblical text:

- The law in Deut 12:20–28 is prefaced by two introductions: (20) כִּי יִרְחִיב יְהוָה כִּי יִרְחַק מִמֶּךָ הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יִבְחָר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ (21) and אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶת גְּבוּלְךָ כֹּאֲשֶׁר דָּבַר לְךָ לְשׁוֹם שְׁמוֹ שָׁם. This section in 11QT^a was probably introduced by one prefatory phrase only: כִּי אֲרַחֲבִי אֶת גְּבוּלְכָה כֹּאֲשֶׁר דְּבַרְתִּי לָכָה וְאִמְרָתָהּ אֹכִילָהּ בָּשָׂר כִּי א[וְתָה].³⁹
- Several phrases were omitted in 11QT^a because they repeat phrases in the immediate context:

39 The immediate joining of two introductory phrases as suggested by Yadin (כִּי אֲרַחֲבִי אֶת) is inconsistent with the avoidance of repetition in 11QT^a. (גְּבוּלְכָה ... וְכִי יִרְחַק מִמֶּכָּה)

- (21) (כי א) וְהָיָה נִפְשָׁהּ 2 LIII 2 (covered by 11QT^a)
 (22) כְּעֵבִי 5–4 LIII 4 (abbreviated in 11QT^a)
 (וכאיל)
 (22) (24) לֹא תֹאכְלוּ, (25) לֹא תֹאכְלוּ, (24) כֵּן תֹאכְלוּ (“redundant” repetitions).

This contrastive analysis of the biblical text of Deuteronomy 12 and 11QT^a LIII 2–8 brings to the fore the differences in their approach. 11QT^a presents a more practical approach to the formulation of the biblical law than Deuteronomy 12. A similar difference is visible in a contrastive analysis of Lev 23:27–29 and 11QT^a XXV 10–12.

This analysis shows how the small changes, created through the rewriting technique relate to the text of MT. They are easily taken as variant readings to be recorded in a critical apparatus, but in my view cases like these need not be recorded. Therefore, due to the uncertainty relating to the textual background of 11QT^a, I suggest to take into consideration only deviations from MT in 11QT^a that are supported by *external evidence*. If this suggestion is followed, no detail of 11QT^a should be recorded in an edition like *BHQ* if not supported by external evidence.⁴⁰ Obviously, in this way possible unique variants of the scroll will be disregarded as suspected exponents of rewriting.

In an earlier study, I summarized the textual relations between the sources as follows:⁴¹

$$\begin{aligned} 11QT^a &= LXX \text{ and } SP \neq MT : 22 \text{ (many cases of common harmonizations)}^{42} \\ 11QT^a &= LXX \neq MT \neq SP : 26 \end{aligned}$$

40 Indeed, all references in *BHQ* to variants in 11QT^a are supported by other witnesses, for example: Deut 12:25 and 13:19 = 11QT^a LIII 7, LV 14 (cf. 12:28); 12:26 = 11QT^a LIII 9–10; 16:19 = 11QT^a LI 12 (= LXX); 16:20 = 11QT^a LIII 7 (= LXX S); 17:16 = 11QT^a LVI 16; 21:6 = 11QT^a LXIII 5 (the lack of 11QT^a column notations in *BHQ* decreases the value of the notation). Not all the relevant differences between MT and 11QT^a are recorded in *BHQ* (see 12:22 בָּךְ; 18:5 לִפְנֵי; 20:17 וְהִגְדִּישׁ). On the other hand, in 21:23 11QT^a is quoted without support from the versions.

41 E. Tov, “The Temple Scroll and Old Testament Textual Criticism,” *ErIsr* 16 (Hebr.; 1982), 100–111 (109–110).

42 In a study devoted precisely to this issue, Schiffman stresses the common basis of some of the readings of 11QT^a and the LXX, stressing their common origin, pointing in these cases to common halakhic exegesis. For example, the addition of בָּכָה in LIII 4 (= Deut 12:22, agreeing also with SP) and in LII 4 (= Deut 15:22) is meant to stress that the “pure” and “impure” refer to the worshipers, not to animals. See L.H. Schiffman, “The Septuagint and the Temple Scroll: Shared ‘Halakhic’ Variants,” in: *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)* (ed. G.J. Brooke & B. Lindars; SBLSCS 33; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992), 277–297.

11QT^a = SP ≠ LXX : 2

11QT^a = SP MT 6 (not reflected in translation).

While 11QT^a is thus closer to the LXX and SP than to MT, there are also extensive differences among these sources:

11QT^a ≠ SP and LXX : 33×, usually when LXX = SP

11QT^a ≠ LXX : 6

11QT^a ≠ SP : 11.

The combined evidence indicates that 11QT^a is not exclusively close to any of the three sources. Accordingly, the source of 11QT^a should be characterized as non-aligned. That biblical manuscript certainly included more variants than included in our analysis, since we chose not to include readings of 11QT^a that are unsupported by other sources.

For our investigation of the text-critical background of the Torah it is very significant that seven of the readings that 11QT^a has in common with the LXX and SP and six additional ones are in the nature of harmonizations.⁴³ Other harmonizing pluses can no longer be identified. This situation reflects our earlier observation that the most popular Torah text in Palestine was often of a less precise nature,⁴⁴ such as visible in harmonizations. The secondary readings that SP and LXX have in common, among them many harmonizations, are shared with 11QT^a and several other sources.

The analysis of the biblical quotations in *Jubilees* points in the same direction. As in the case of 11QT^a, the large deviations in *Jubilees* from MT are disregarded for the textual–literary analysis. Among the smaller variants, we again focus on the variants that are supported by either MT, SP, LXX, or one of the Qumran scrolls,⁴⁵ disregarding the unique readings of *Jubilees* since they can-

43 See Tov, "Temple Scroll," 104–107 for the evidence.

44 See Tov, "Temple Scroll," 184.

45 The textual analysis of *Jubilees* is based on the Ethiopic and Latin texts, as the few Hebrew Qumran fragments provide too little material. In places in which the text can be examined we easily identify elements that are identical to the text common to MT LXX SP as well as brief changes in the formulation. 4Q223–224 Unit 2, col. v (Jub 39:9–40:7) = Gen 39:12–41:43 with many words and verses skipped. 4Q225 2 i 4–14 runs parallel to Gen 15:3–6, 22:2 and col. ii to Gen 22:7–11. One also notices an occasional exclusive reading that could have been based on a variant, such as col. v 3 (Jub 39:10) אשר אהב[תה] (thus also the Ethiopic translation) for MT LXX SP אשר הבאת (Gen 39:17). The fidelity of the Ethiopic translation to its Greek original, and the latter's fidelity to the Hebrew can be established by an

not be disentangled from Jubilees' exponents of rewriting. In our analysis, we are led by two seminal studies of VanderKam.⁴⁶

According to VanderKam, based on a count of agreements, Jubilees is especially close to the LXX and SP, texts that were "at home in Palestine."⁴⁷ However, when disagreements are also taken into consideration, VanderKam realized that "Jub's biblical citations were drawn from a text that was rather more independent of the Palestinian family of which Sam and the LXX are, at different stages supposed to be witnesses." Nevertheless, Jubilees is closer to SP and LXX than to the other texts.⁴⁸

Like VanderKam, Hendel, basing himself on "indicative errors" in Genesis 1–11, considers the connection between the LXX and SP to be stronger than between the other members of the triad SP LXX MT.⁴⁹ His stemma depicts two hyparchetypes for Genesis 1–11, the proto-M and an old Palestinian hyparchetype.⁵⁰

I do accept the idea of an old Scripture text best represented by LXX and SP, and quoted by 11QT^a, Jubilees, and Pseudo-Philo's LAB.⁵¹

analysis of the cave 4 fragments. See J.C. VanderKam, *DJD* XIII, 4, 56. At an earlier stage, J.C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), 18–95 had reached the same conclusion on the basis of the cave 11 fragments of Jubilees.

46 VanderKam, *Jubilees* (1977); idem, "Jubilees and Hebrew Texts of Genesis–Exodus," *Textus* 14 (1988): 71–85. The data were provided by VanderKam in 1977, but his summarizing statements in 1988 were clearer.

47 *Jubilees*, 137. This conclusion was repeated in VanderKam, "Jubilees and Hebrew Texts" (1988), 73.

48 "... if there was a Palestinian family of texts of which the LXX and Sam are two representatives and Jubilees a third, then it must have been a very loose conglomeration of divergent texts" ("Jubilees and Hebrew Texts," 83, 84).

49 Hendel, *Genesis 1–11*, 100. See also chapter 27 in this volume.

50 Hendel also mentions horizontal influence between the hyparchetypes. However, this part of the discussion is unnecessarily detailed, because it is based on the assumption that MT SP LXX are directly related to each other without other texts intervening. We should not forget that these three texts are only three out of a much larger number of texts.

51 The text quoted by LAB is often close to the *Vorlage* of the LXX, named Palestinian by D. Harrington, "The Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*," *CBQ* 33 (1971): 1–17. Harrington provides examples of the proximity of LAB to the *Vorlage* of the LXX (not to the LXX itself) in the Torah, sometimes shared with SP, and in the other books often with the LXX and the Lucianic tradition of the LXX. However, this study does not mention full statistics, and it lacks reverse examples of disagreements between these sources and LAB. For a more detailed analysis of this issue, see my forthcoming study "The Textual Base of the Biblical Quotations in Second Temple Compositions."

3 *Pesharim* and Bible Commentaries

Of the three groups of Scripture-like texts, the Bible commentaries and *pesharim* are usually not confused with Scripture texts. They are discussed here because the problems of extracting variants from them resemble the recognition of variants in Scripture-like texts. Bible commentaries do not reflect large differences from MT+, but only differences in small details, which are sometimes difficult to identify.

3.1 *Pesharim*

It is easy to differentiate between the Bible text and the exposition in the *pesharim*. The Bible texts contain many variants vis-à-vis MT in small details, while some variants are found in the exposition.

Different views have been voiced regarding the text-critical value of the biblical text quoted by the *pesharim*. A positive evaluation is reflected in the textual editions that incorporate readings from these *pesharim*: *BHS* and *BHQ* for 1QpHab, *HUB* for the *pesharim* on Isaiah, and the *Biblia Qumranica* for the Minor Prophets. The editors of these texts considered the evidence convincing enough to be recorded in an apparatus. For example, in Habakkuk 1–2, *BHQ* records many variants, e.g. 1:8 וקול for MT וקלו and 1:12 למוכיחו for MT להוכיח. At the same time, other scholars cautioned that many so-called deviations from MT in the *pesharim* and commentaries were due to contextual exegesis.⁵² Brooke focused on exclusive readings in the *pesharim* not supported by MT, ancient Hebrew manuscripts, or the ancient versions. He demonstrated that the biblical text quoted in the *pesharim* introduced some changes in syntactical and grammatical details, e.g. in person, as well as in the omission of parts of verses, and in one case of ten verses, viz., in 4QpIsa^b 2 lacking 5:14–24.⁵³ These changes are used by Brooke as an argument against the text-critical use of the *pesharim*.

In textual analyses, a maximalistic approach underlies the lists of presumed variant readings for 1QpHab by Brownlee and for all the *pesharim* by Lim.⁵⁴

52 E.g., G. Molin, "Der Habakkukkomentar von 'En Fesha in der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft," *Tz* 8 (1952): 340–357; G.J. Brooke, "The Biblical Texts in the Qumran Commentaries: Scribal Errors or Exegetical Variants?" in: *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee* (ed. C.A. Evans & W.F. Stinespring; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987), 85–100, both with references to earlier studies.

53 Brooke also includes among the changed readings cases of metathesis and other playful changes of letters, such as for Nah 3:6 כראי in 4QpNah כאורה (4Q169 3 iii 2).

54 W.H. Brownlee, *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran* (JBL Mono-

Thus, according to Lim,⁵⁵ 17 percent of all the words of the MT of Nahum differ from the corresponding segments of 4QpNah and 12 percent of all the words of 1QpHab. However, from these numbers one has to deduct morphological variations, some orthographical variants and a large number of contextual changes, all of which could have been inserted by the author of the *peshet*. This evidence leads to the possibility, but no more than a possibility, that the underlying biblical text of the *pesharim* did not differ much from MT. On the other hand, if it could be proven that the biblical text in a *peshet* once circulated separately as a biblical manuscript, it would resemble the free approach of 1QIsa^a and many other texts. Believing this to be the case, several scholars⁵⁶ characterized the underlying texts of the *pesharim* as “vulgar.”⁵⁷

3.2 Commentaries

No specific biblical text or text group is reflected in the nonbiblical Qumran compositions,⁵⁸ both sectarian and non-sectarian.⁵⁹ Only 4Q252 provides enough material for an extensive analysis.⁶⁰

graph Series XI; Philadelphia, 1959); T.H. Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 69–109; idem, “Biblical Quotations in the Pesharim and the Text of the Bible: Methodological Considerations,” in: *The Bible as Book*, 71–89.

55 Lim, *Holy Scripture*, 91.

56 J.P.M. van der Ploeg, “Le rouleau d’Habacuc de la grotte de ‘Ain Feshā,” *BO* 8 (1951): 2–11 (4); K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer* (BHT 15; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1953), 48; P. Kahle in a review of Elliger in *TLZ* 79 (1954): 478–479; S. Segert, “Zur Habakuk-Rolle aus dem Funde vom Toten Meer VI,” *ArOr* 23 (1955): 575–619 (608).

57 At the same time, the text of these *pesharim* should not be characterized as a separate “recension,” as suggested, for example, by M. Collin, “Recherches sur l’histoire textuelle du prophète Michée,” *VT* 21 (1971): 281–297 on the basis of an analysis of 1QpMic, which was characterized by him as reflecting a third recension of the biblical book, alongside the MT and LXX. This characterization was rejected by L.A. Sinclair, “Hebrew Text [*sic*] of the Qumran Micah Peshet and Textual Traditions of the Minor Prophets,” *RevQ* 11 (1983): 253–263.

58 4QCommGen A (4Q252), 4QCommGen B (4Q253), 4QCommGen C (4Q254), 4QCommGen D (4Q254a), 4QTanh (4Q176), 4QCommMal (4Q253a).

59 A. Lange, “The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process,” in: *The Bible as Book*, 21–30; idem, *Handbuch*, 158–168.

60 4Q252, an unusual text from the point of view of its structure, is closest in its adherence to the Scripture text after the *pesharim*. See M. Bernstein, “4Q252: From Re-Written Bible to Biblical Commentary,” *JJS* 45 (1994): 1–27; idem, “4Q252: Method and Context, Genre and Sources,” *JQR* 85 (1994–1995): 61–79; T.H. Lim, “Notes on 4Q252 fr. 1, cols. i–ii,” *JJS* 44 (1993): 121–126. In the first columns, 4Q252 presents a rewritten text very closely adhering to the

In the rewritten Bible text of 4Q252, the close relation to Scripture is clearly visible in long stretches of text, but at the same time 4Q252 removes what it considers superfluous elements from the context without harming its meaning.⁶¹ In view of the frequent stylistic abbreviations in 4Q252, its shorter text cannot be taken as support for an assumed short *Vorlage*. This applies also to some assumed stylistic changes.

Indeed, 4Q252 represents a small number of variants supported by the other witnesses. These deviations have been reviewed in detail by Brooke,⁶² who tried to fit them into the framework of earlier-expressed textual theories. Brooke sees a degree of closeness between 4Q252 and the LXX. We accept that view, and expand this vision to the SP, which has been left out of the analysis by Brooke. Although the data are not completely clear, it seems that the allegiance of 4Q252 lies more with the LXX and SP than MT.⁶³

Summarizing, in the textual criticism of Hebrew Scripture, we use different types of materials, not only those that pertain directly to Hebrew Scripture, but also those that are included in Scripture-like compositions. The latter group, consisting of a few subgroups, contains compositions that have the appearance of Scripture, but are not. Liturgical texts have the appearance of Scripture texts, and they even carry names of biblical books of the Torah and Psalms, such as 11QPs^a, 4QPs^a. However, in our view, the large deviations from MT in these scrolls should not be applied to biblical criticism, textual or literary, since they were written for different purposes. If they were used within textual and literary criticism, the implications for biblical criticism would be far-reaching. Likewise, in my view, text-critical editions should not record the large deviations in rewritten Scripture texts, or many of the small differences. The recording of variants should be limited to those readings that are supported by other sources. The same procedure should be followed in the study of Bible commentaries, while *pesharim* provide more relevant data.

biblical text with a fuller orthography, without altering it, but adding exegetical remarks, mainly relating to chronology. Then it moves slowly away from that pattern to a more free relation to the Scripture text, and at that point it also uses the term *peshar*.

61 For example, *מאחז* MT 8:8] *וישלח את היונה* I 14; *הקלו המים מעל פני האדמה* MT 8:8] *הקלו המים* I 14. This procedure is followed even in the removal of one of two synonymous words in a poetical passage. *כחי וראשית אוני* MT 49:3] *ורישית אוני* IV 4.

62 Brooke, "Some Remarks."

63 According to this description, 4Q252 is very problematic for discovering its underlying biblical text. In principle, any of the small deviations from MT could present an ancient variant, but when seen in the framework of the large changes that possibility seems very slim. This free approach makes it possible that what looks like a stylistic or linguistic change is not an ancient variant, but it is unlikely.

The Genealogical Lists in Genesis 5 and 11 in Three Different Versions

The textual witnesses of Hebrew Scripture differ in many chronological details, both in individual instances and in groups of details, such as the chronologies of the Kings of Judah and Israel, the chronology of the flood, and in genealogical lists. The topic of this paper is the systematic differences among three textual witnesses of genealogical lists in Genesis 5 and 11 included in MT, LXX, and SP. Special attention will be directed to the background and *Sitz im Leben* of these differences. Our working hypothesis is that the differences between the numbers listed in the three texts do not indicate regular scribal activity, but reflect two or three different *recensions* or *editions* of a single list. The weakness of this theory is that the tendencies of the presumed recensions cannot be established with certainty.

The lists of the antediluvian (Gen 5:1–32) and postdiluvian patriarchs (11:10–32), both named *sefer toldot*, have been transmitted in three different versions preserving major differences between them: MT, LXX, and SP. Each of these three witnesses is followed by a number of additional sources (see below). The differences pertain to the chronological data, not to the names, although in one case the LXX includes a patriarch not found in the other two sources (“Kenan 11,” see below). Although the LXX has been transmitted in Greek, these details should not be ascribed to the translator, but to his Hebrew *Vorlage*.¹ We thus compare three sets of Hebrew data, expressing a view on their comparative value and the possible relation between them. At the same time it should be remembered that these three witnesses constitute three out of many texts,

1 It seems to us that translators may have changed major or minor details, but they did not go as far as to recalculate the logic or system of genealogical lists. The LXX translation of Genesis is relatively literal, although some freedom in small details is recognizable, but no large-scale translational pluses, minuses, or changes are found in this version (the differences in Gen 31:46–52 LXX probably reflect an earlier text, see *TCHB*, 309). Accordingly, any recalculation of chronological lists by a translator is highly unlikely. Furthermore, the LXX version of the lists has much in common with the SP (see below), especially in chapter 11, strengthening the assumption that the two phenomena took place at the Hebrew level. However, some scholars ascribe the changes to the Greek translator himself: G.J. Wenham, *Genesis 1–15* (Word Biblical Commentary; Waco, TX: Word, 1987), 130; É. Puech, *DJD XXXVII*, 263–289 (264).

since in early centuries several or many additional scrolls were circulating, requiring us to retain humility in analyzing the known sources. In the analysis of these texts, some tendencies are recognized, but several details will remain nebulous, not only because the recognition of any tendency is hypothetical, but also because of the possibility of scribal mistakes complicating the recognition of any tendency.²

Starting with the list of the *ten* antediluvian patriarchs in 5:1–32, we record the following data in the Tables from MT, SP, and the LXX:

1. Name of the patriarch

f(athered)–the date at which the patriarch fathered his first son, or when the son was born³

r(emainder) of years the patriarch lived after his first born was born

t(otal) number of years of the patriarch (this number is lacking in chapter 5).

To these numbers we add in brackets the absolute dates according to the biblical chronology:⁴

2. Year of birth A.M.

Dates of the complete life span of the patriarch according to the biblical chronology.

3. Reconstructed summary of the relation between the sources, usually expressed as “p[lus] 100” (that is, the number in the LXX and/or SP is 100 years

2 One possible source of discrepancy between the chronological data is the writing of numbers with number signs, such as found in some of the nonbiblical Qumran scrolls, especially in calendrical texts. See *Scribal Practices*, 212–213. No number signs have been found in biblical texts from the Judean Desert, but they could have been included in earlier copies. In any event, most of the differences are too systematic in order to be ascribed to scribal mishaps. On the other hand, whenever the numbers do not conform with the views of Hendel, *Genesis 1–11*, 73, he assumes scribal error, for three patriarchs in the antediluvian list (*ibid.*, 64–69) and for four patriarchs in the postdiluvian list (*ibid.*, 73–74).

3 The term used in these lists for fathering (הוליד) probably refers to the birth of the first-borns. There is some imprecision with this term, for example in the case of Noah, where the text in 5:32 mentions the fathering or birth of Noah's three sons in a single year. The mentioning of Abraham's age at the time of his son's birth (ברוילד לו את בנו 21:5) strengthens the assumption that the phrase refers to the birth of the son rather than the fathering, even though a different conjugation of the verb is involved.

4 Earlier lists agree in most of the details adduced here on the basis of the biblical text, e.g. J. Skinner, *Genesis, ICC* (2nd ed.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1930), 134, 233; Hendel, *Genesis 1–11*, 65, 72.

higher than MT), “m[inus] 100,” or “idem” (LXX or SP is identical with MT). The focusing on the numbers of MT is conventional, and does not involve a judgment on the original status of that version.

TABLE 1 *Antediluvian patriarchs in the LXX and SP in Genesis 5 (compared with MT)*

Name	MT	LXX	Summary	SP	Summary
Adam					
born [A.M.]	[0]	idem		idem	
fathered [A.M.]	130	230	p 100	idem	idem
remainder	800	700	m 100	idem	idem
total years	930	idem	idem	idem	idem
lived [A.M.]	[0–930]	idem		[0–930]	
Seth					
born [A.M.]	[130]	[230]			
fathered [A.M.]	105 [235]	205 [435]	p 100	idem	idem
remainder	807	707	m 100	idem	idem
total years	912	idem	idem	idem	idem
lived [A.M.]	[130–1042]	[230–1142]		[130–1042]	
Enosh					
born [A.M.]	[235]	[435]			
fathered [A.M.]	90 [325]	190 [625]	p 100	idem	idem
remainder	815	715	m 100	idem	idem
total years	905	idem	idem	idem	idem
lived [A.M.]	[235–1140]	[435–1340]		[235–1140]	
Kenan					
born [A.M.]	[325]	[625]			
fathered [A.M.]	70 [395]	170 [795]	p 100	idem	idem
remainder	840	740	m 100	idem	idem
total years	910	idem	idem	idem	idem
lived [A.M.]	[325–1235]	[625–1535]		[325–1235]	

TABLE 1 *Antediluvian patriarchs in the LXX and SP in Genesis 5 (compared with MT) (cont.)*

Name	MT	LXX	Summary	SP	Summary
Mehalel					
born [A.M.]	[395]	[795]			
fathered [A.M.]	65 [460]	165 [960]	p 100	idem	idem
remainder	830	730	m 100	idem	idem
total years	895	idem	idem	idem	idem
lived [A.M.]	[395–1290]	[795–1690]		[395–1290]	
Jared					
born [A.M.]	[460]	[960]		[460]	
fathered [A.M.]	162 [622]	idem [1122]	idem	62 [522]	m 100
remainder	800	idem	idem	785	m 15
total years	962	idem	idem	847	m 115
lived [A.M.]	[460–1422]	[960–1922]		[460–1307]	
Enoch					
born [A.M.]	[622]	[1122]		[522]	
fathered [A.M.]	65 [687]	165 [1287]	p 100	idem [587]	idem
remainder	300	200	m 100	idem	idem
total years	365	idem	idem	idem	idem
lived [A.M.]	[622–987]	[1122–1487]		[522–887]	
Methuselah					
born [A.M.]	[687]	[1287]		[587]	
fathered [A.M.]	187 [874]	167 [1454]	m 20	67 [654]	m 120
remainder	782	802	p 20	653	m 129
total years	969	idem	idem	720	m 249
lived [A.M.]	[687–1656]	[1287–2256]		[587–1307]	
Lamech					
born [A.M.]	[874]	[1454]		[654]	
fathered [A.M.]	182 [1056]	188 [1642]	p 6	53 [707]	m 129
remainder	595	565	m 30	600	p 5
total years	777	753	m 24	653	m 124
lived [A.M.]	[874–1651]	[1454–2207]		[654–1307]	

Name	MT	LXX	Summary	SP	Summary
Noah					
born [A.M.]	[1056]	[1642]		[707]	
fathered [A.M.]	500 [1556]	idem [2142]	idem	idem [1207]	idem
age at the time of the flood	600 [1656] (7:6)	idem [2242] (7:6)	idem	idem [1307]	idem
remainder	350 ⁵	idem	idem	idem	idem
total years	950	idem	idem	idem	idem
lived [A.M.]	[1056–2006]	[1642–2594]			
flood [A.M.]	[1656]	[2242]		[1307]	

The above-listed data reflect the MT, LXX, and SP, while the other sources agree with them, fully or partially. The Targumim, Peshitta, and the Vulgate agree with MT; Jubilees reflects SP for the antediluvian patriarchs and the LXX for the postdiluvian patriarchs; Josephus usually reflects the LXX with the exception of the date of Methuselah. Pseudo-Philo usually reflects LXX with a few MT readings.⁶

In spite of the internal differences between the MT and LXX in the dates of the fathering of the sons and the remainder of the years after the fathering, the totals for the MT and LXX are identical, with the sole exception of Lamech (life span in LXX totals 24 years less than MT). The total number is almost always the same for the MT and SP.

The relationship between the three sources is emphasized in Table 2 in which the reconstructed data are omitted.

The assumption that these three texts derived from one original base form is logical since they significantly resemble each other. It is equally logical to reconstruct a fourth text as archetypal, changed or corrupted in the three-known texts.⁷ However, additional forms of this list, including earlier ones,

5 Noah fathered his children at the age of 500 (5:32), and he was 600 at the age of the flood (7:6). He lived another 350 years after the flood (9:28), altogether 950 years (9:29). This calculation is slightly irregular when compared with the other patriarchs. Note that not all the data are included in the list itself.

6 For a summary and references to studies of these post-biblical sources, see Hendel, *Genesis 1–11*, 69–71.

7 This option was chosen by Hendel, *Genesis 1–11*, 64–69. In his reconstructed original text of chapter 5, Hendel usually considers the joint reading of MT SP as original, once that of MT LXX, once a reading of SP, and once he inserts an emendation (p. 130). In Genesis 11 he

TABLE 2 *Antediluvian patriarchs: relations between MT, LXX, and SP (Genesis 5)*

Name	MT	LXX	Summary	SP	Summary
Adam					
fathered	130	230	p 100	idem	idem
remainder	800	700	m 100	idem	idem
total years	930	idem	idem	idem	idem
Seth					
fathered	105	205	p 100	idem	idem
remainder	807	707	m 100	idem	idem
total years	912	idem	idem	idem	idem
Enosh					
fathered	90	190	p 100	idem	idem
remainder	815	715	m 100	idem	idem
total years	905	idem	idem	idem	idem
Kenan					
fathered	70	170	p 100	idem	idem
remainder	840	740	m 100	idem	idem
total years	910	idem	idem	idem	idem
Mehalel					
fathered	65	165	p 100	idem	idem
remainder	830	730	m 100	idem	idem
total years	895	idem	idem	idem	idem
Jared					
fathered	162	idem	idem	62	m 100
remainder	800	idem	idem	785	m 15
total years	962	idem	idem	847	m 115

usually prefers the reading of MT, thrice MT LXX, and once LXX (see p. 146). Taken together, Hendel usually prefers the readings of MT. On the other hand, I find it difficult to define criteria for determining the original status of details. These doubts are shared by Wenham, *Genesis 1–15*, 133: “... there is no obvious answer to the text-critical problems posed by these chapters. The LXX appears to have least in its favor, but whether the SamPent, MT or some other scheme is the most primitive is hard to tell.”

Name	MT	LXX	Summary	SP	Summary
Enoch					
fathered	65	165	p 100	idem	idem
remainder	300	200	m 100	idem	idem
total years	365	idem	idem	idem	idem
Methuselah					
fathered	187	167	m 20	67	m 120
remainder	782	802	p 20	653	m 129
total years	969	idem	idem	720	m 249
Lamech					
fathered	182	188	p 6	53	m 129
remainder	595	565	m 30	600	p 5
total years	777	753	m 24	653	m 124
Noah					
fathered	500	idem	idem	idem	idem
age at the time of the flood	600	idem	idem	idem	idem
remainder	350	idem	idem	idem	idem
total years	950	idem	idem	idem	idem

may once have circulated, making it increasingly difficult to reconstruct its original shape.

We now turn to some detailed remarks on the relation between the three texts. The details in Tables 1–2 show that the three texts display different versions, possibly recensions, of the same list. The three texts share the same patterns:

- a. General structure, not involving narrative details, as are often added in lists.
- b. The chronological data are usually presented as round numbers, often including hundreds (100, 200, etc.). These round numbers appear more in chapter 5 than in 11 (Table 3).
- c. All the patriarchs are included in all three sources.

Thus, the following patterns emerge:

- a. With the exception of Lamech, the total life span of the patriarchs coincides in MT and the LXX. This is also true for the relation between MT and the SP with the exception of Jared, Methuselah, and Lamech.
- b. While the texts agree regarding the total life span, there still are internal differences regarding the dates for the *f*(athering) and the *r*(emaining) number of years. The most frequent pattern for the LXX in chapter 5 is a larger number for *f* than in MT (usually $f + 100$) together with a smaller number for the *r*(emaining) years, usually decreased by the same amount ($r - 100$), for Adam, Seth, Enosh, Kenan, Mehalel, appearing continuously as the first five entries in the list, together with the seventh entry (Enoch). In practical terms, most firstborns are born *x* years later in the LXX than in MT.
In two instances the LXX equals MT (Jared, Noah), while in two other instances, the LXX follows a different pattern:

LXX $f - 20, r + 20$ (Methuselah)

LXX $f + 6, r - 30$ (Lamech)

In this way the subsequent events are also delayed by *x* years. Accordingly, the dates for the fathering of the firstborns in the LXX *add* 586 years to those of MT, and as a result, the flood takes place 586 years later in the LXX (2242 A.M.) than in MT (1656).

- c. SP usually agrees with MT (Adam, Seth, Enosh, Kenan, Mehalel, Enoch, Noah, appearing continuously in the first five entries in the list, together with the seventh and last entry), but when it does not, SP in chapter 5 has a smaller number for *f* than in MT, altogether *decreased* by 349 years. As a result of these differences, the flood occurs 349 years earlier in SP (1307 A.M.) than MT (1656). In other instances, SP presents lower numbers for the life span than MT: Jared 115 years, Methuselah 249, Lamech 124 years.
- d. The differences between the numbers in the three sources cannot be coincidental. Compared with MT, the data express a tendency of increasing numbers in LXX and decreasing numbers in SP. Furthermore, the LXX used large round numbers for six of the first seven patriarchs, leaving the smaller numbers for the next ones in the list. The system is not straightforward, however, since in the case of Methuselah the LXX increased and decreased the number by 20 ($f + 20, r - 20$).⁸

8 The reason for the different pattern in the case of Methuselah is unclear. If these numbers reflect a mistake in the calculation, it could explain the miraculous fact that in the LXX version Methuselah survived the flood by 14 years. This fact intrigued the Church Fathers much,

Background of the Differences

Since the three texts usually agree, we should try to locate the common denominator of the differences between them. The LXX usually adds to the dates of *f* of MT, and the SP diminishes them. In earlier research it has been suggested that the main reason for the changes is that the three texts revised an earlier text in which several patriarchs survived the flood.⁹ This explanation is contradicted by the evidence of the LXX for Methuselah (see n. 8), but a better theory has not yet been put forth.

MT

It seems to me that a text like MT formed the basis of the revised form of the two parallel lists, but MT itself could also have revised an earlier list.¹⁰ In MT one patriarch dies in the year of the flood (Methuselah, *d.* 1656) and another one five years beforehand (Lamech, *d.* 1651). These dates may reflect an attempt to bring the dates of these patriarchs into harmony with the date of the flood.

LXX

The fact that almost all patriarchs did not survive the flood may indicate that at one point some patriarchs lived after the date of the flood according to the original list. After all, the lists derived from a source other than the narratives. The one detail that goes against this assumption is the strange fact that Methuselah was still alive 14 years after the flood, until 2256. At the same time, the personal data of most patriarchs were postdated, thus postponing the flood by 586 years from 1656 A.M. to 2242.

SP

Differing from the LXX and MT, SP pushed the date of the flood up from 1656 to 1307 A.M., and in its system the patriarchs died either before the flood or in the very same year (Jared, Methuselah, Lamech).

as analyzed in depth by T. O'Loughlin, "The Controversy over Methuselah's Death: Proto-Chronology and the Origins of the Western Concept of Inerrancy," *Recherches de Theologie ancienne et médiévale* 62 (1995): 182–225.

9 Thus Hendel, *Genesis 1–11*, 62–64. Ulrich follows a similar path: E. Ulrich, "The Evolutionary Growth of the Pentateuch in the Second Temple Period," in *Pentateuchal Traditions in the Late Second Temple Period: Proceedings of the International Workshop in Tokyo, August 28–31, 2007* (ed. Akio Moriya and Gohei Hata; JSJSup 158; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 39–56 (47–48).

10 Thus Hendel, *Genesis 1–11*, 62.

TABLE 3 *Postdiluvian patriarchs in the LXX and SP (compared with MT)*

Name	MT	LXX	Summ.	SP	Summary
Shem					
born [A.M.]	[1556]	[2142]		[1207]	
fathered [A.M.]	100 [1656]	idem [2242]	idem	idem [1307]	idem
remainder	500	idem	idem	idem	idem
total years	[600]	idem	idem	[600]	idem
lived [A.M.]	[1556–2156]	[2142–2742]		[1207–1807]	
adjustment ¹¹	+ 2		+ 2	+ 2	
Arpachshad					
born [A.M.]	[1658]	[2244]		[1309]	
fathered [A.M.]	35 [1693]	135 [2379]	p 100	135 [1444]	p 100
remainder	403	430	p 27	303	m 100
total years	[438]	[585]	p 127	438	idem
lived A.M.	[1658–2096]	[2244–2829]		[1309–1747]	
Kenan II¹²					
born [A.M.]	–	[2379]		–	
fathered [A.M.]	–	130 [2509]	p 130	–	
remainder	–	330	p 330	–	
total years	–	[460]	p 460	–	
lived [A.M.]	–	[2379–2839]		–	

11 When Noah was 500 years old he fathered Shem (5:32), and since Noah was 600 years old at the beginning of the flood (7:6), Shem should have been 100 at that time, and not 2 years later as in the note in 11:10 (“When Shem was 100 years old he fathered Arpachshad, two years after the flood”) that conflicts with the list in chapter 5. Since the calculations for the postdiluvian generations start with Shem, two years need to be added to the years after the flood (added to the year of birth of the first generation) by way of adjustments between the different documents.

12 This is an additional patriarch, mentioned in the LXX of 11:13. See below. This addition is artificial since the chronological data for Kenan II repeat those of his son Shelah. Furthermore, no such person is known from the lists of MT LXX in 1Chron 1:8, 24.

Name	MT	LXX	Summ.	SP	Summary
Shelah					
born [A.M.]	[1693]	[2509]		[1444]	
fathered [A.M.]	30 [1723]	130 [2639]	p 100	130 [1574]	p 100
remainder	403	330	m 73	303	m 100
total years	[433]	[460]	p 27	433	idem
lived [A.M.]	[1693–2126]	[2509–2969]		[1444–1879]	
Eber					
born [A.M.]	[1723]	[2639]		[1574]	
fathered [A.M.]	34 [1757]	134 [2773]	p 100	134 [1708]	p 100
remainder	430	370	m 40	270	m 160
total years	[464]	[504]	p 60	404	m 60
lived [A.M.]	[1723–2187]	[2639–3143]		[1574–1978]	
Peleg					
born [A.M.]	[1757]	[2773]		[1708]	
fathered [A.M.]	30 [1787]	130 [2903]	p 100	130 [1838]	p 100
remainder	209	idem	idem	109	m 100
total years	[239]	[339]	p 100	239	idem
lived [A.M.]	[1757–1996]	[2773–3112]		[1708–1947]	
Reu					
born [A.M.]	[1787]	[2903]		[1838]	
fathered [A.M.]	32 [1819]	132 [3035]	p 100	132 [1970]	p 100
remainder	207	7	m 200	107	m 100
total years	[239]	[339]	p 100	239	idem
lived [A.M.]	[1787–2026]	[2903–3242]		[1838–2077]	
Serug					
born [A.M.]	[1819]	[3035]		[1970]	
fathered [A.M.]	30 [1849]	130 [3165]	p 100	130 [2100]	p 100
remainder	200	idem		100	m 100
total years	[230]	[330]		230	idem
lived [A.M.]	[1819–2049]	[3035–3365]		[1970–2200]	

TABLE 3 *Postdiluvian patriarchs in the LXX and SP (cont.)*

Name	MT	LXX	Summ.	SP	Summary
Nahor					
born [A.M.]	[1849]	[3165]		[2100]	
fathered [A.M.]	29 [1878]	79 [3244]	p 50	79 [2179]	p 50
remainder	119	129	p 10	69	m 50
total years	[148]	[208]	p 60	148	idem
lived [A.M.]	[1849–1997]	[3165–3373]		[2100–2248]	
Terah					
born [A.M.]	1878	[3244]		[2179]	
fathered [A.M.]	70 [1948]	idem [3314]	idem	idem [2249]	
remainder	[135]	–	idem	[75]	
total years	205 ¹³	idem	idem	145	[m 60]
lived [A.M.]	[1878–2083]	[3244–3449]		[2179–2324]	
Abraham¹⁴					
born A.M.	[1948]	[3314]		[2249]	
fathered ¹⁵ [A.M.]	80, 100 [2028, 2048]	80, 100	idem	[2329, 2349]	idem
remainder	–	–	idem		idem
total years ¹⁶	175	idem	idem	idem	idem
lived [A.M.]	[1948–2123]	[3314–3489]		[2249–2424]	

We admit that there is no strong evidence for the reason why an earlier list was revised in two or all three versions. Such a revision is more evident in the list of the postdiluvian patriarchs in chapter 11 to which we now turn.

The pattern of increasing and decreasing the numbers in the LXX and SP, more frequent than in chapter 5 (Tables 1–2), is summarized in Table 4.

13 Gen 11:32.
14 The data about Abraham do not belong to the list of chapter 11.
15 Gen 16:16; 21:5.
16 Gen 25:7.

TABLE 4 *Postdiluvian patriarchs: relations between MT, LXX, and SP*

Name	MT	LXX	Summary	SP	Summary
Shem					
fathered	100	idem	idem	idem	idem
remainder	500	idem	idem	idem	idem
total years	[600]	idem	idem	idem	idem
adjustment	+ 2		+ 2	+ 2	
Arpachshad					
fathered	35	135	p 100	135	p 100
remainder	403	430	p 27	303	m 100
total years	[438]	[585]	p 127	438	idem
“Kenan II”¹⁷					
fathered	–	130	p 130	–	–
remainder	–	330	p 330	–	–
total years	–	[460]	p 460	–	–
Shelah					
fathered	30	130	p 100	130	p 100
remainder	403	330	m 73	303	m 100
total years	[433]	[460]	p 27	433	idem
Eber					
fathered	34	134	p 100	134	p 100
remainder	430	370	m 40	270	m 160
total years	[464]	[504]	p 60	404	m 60
Peleg					
fathered	30	130 [2903]	p 100	130	p 100
remainder	209	idem	idem	109	m 100
total years	[239]	[339]	p 100	239	idem

17 Gen 11:32 LXX.

TABLE 4 *Postdiluvian patriarchs: relations between MT, LXX, and SP (cont.)*

Name	MT	LXX	Summary	SP	Summary
Reu					
fathered	32	132	p 100	132	p 100
remainder	207	7	m 200	107	m 100
total years	[239]	[339]	p 100	239	idem
Serug					
fathered	30	130	p 100	130	p 100
remainder	200	idem	idem	100	m 100
total years	[230]	[330]	p 100	230	idem
Nahor					
fathered	29	79	p 50	79	p 50
remainder	119	129	p 10	69	m 50
total years	[148]	[208]	p 60	148	idem
Terah					
fathered	70	idem	idem	idem	idem
remainder	[135]	–	–	idem	idem
total years	205	idem	idem	145	m 60
Abraham					
fathered	80, 100	80, 100	idem	85, 100	p 5, idem
remainder	–	idem	idem	idem	idem
total years	175	idem	idem	idem	idem

The details in Tables 3–4 show that the three texts display different versions, possibly recensions, of the same list. The search for the original form of this list is even more difficult than in chapter 5, while the recensional features are clearer. The three texts share the same features:

- a. General structure.
- b. With the exception of Kenan 11 in the LXX of 11:13 beyond MT and the SP, all the patriarchs are included in the three sources.
- c. The chronological data are presented as round and non-round numbers, often including hundreds (100, 200, etc.), less in chapter 11 than in chapter 5.

- d. The SP and the LXX share revisional principles, leading to the suggestion that MT may be closer to the original.

The following patterns emerge:

- a. In chapter 11 the LXX differs more from MT than in chapter 5: MT agrees twice with the LXX (Shem, Terah), while eight times it has a larger number. Furthermore, Kenan 11 was added in the LXX, possibly in order to create a list of ten patriarchs, since strictly spoken Abraham does not belong to the list in chapter 11.
- b. The SP differs more from MT than in chapter 5. Twice it agrees with MT (Shem, Abraham), but in all the other instances it differs, usually $f + 100$, $r - 100$ (Arpachshad, Shelah, Peleg, Reu, Serug), but also once $f + 50$, $r - 50$ (Nahor), and once $f + 100$, $r - 160$ (Eber). For Terah see n. 20.
- c. In both lists, all three sources agree with each other in the beginnings and ends.
- d. In 6 instances, the LXX and SP add the same amount of 100 years to f , while their calculations for r , and hence also their totals, differ:

Arpachshad f MT 35, LXX and SP + 100

Shelah f MT 30, LXX and SP + 100

Eber f MT 34, LXX and SP + 100

Peleg f MT 30, LXX and SP + 100

Reu f MT 32, LXX and SP + 100

Serug f MT 30, LXX and SP + 100

Cf. also:

Nahor f MT 29, LXX and SP + 50

- e. While in chapter 5 there is no certainty that MT is closer to the original than SP and LXX, in chapter 11, SP displays distinct harmonizing (secondary) traits, sometimes shared with the LXX. Therefore MT is probably closer to the original.

- (1) It completes formulas: an addition in Gen 11:11, 13, 15, 17 LXX SP וימת (καὶ ἀπέθανεν) = 9:29.
- (2) SP adds summaries in the following way: Gen 11:11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25: ויהיו כל ימי & % מאות שנה. In this formula, & stands for the name of the person and % for the number of years = 5:8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 27, 31.

Background of the Differences in Chapters 5 and 11

In chapter 5, the numbers in SP and the LXX, possibly also in MT, were probably meant to postdate the flood, avoiding a situation where the patriarchs would be alive after the flood. On the other hand, in chapter 11 the main problem in the list of MT is that most of the patriarchs were still alive during Abraham's lifetime, for example, when Terah took Abram, Lot, and Sarai from Ur of the Chaldeans to Canaan (11:31).¹⁸ At that time Abram was 75 years old (Gen 12:4), in the year A.M. 2023 according to a calculation of MT, while seven patriarchs were still alive according to MT: Shem (d. 2156), Arpachshad (d. 2096), Shelah (d. 2126), Eber (d. 2187), Reu (d. 2026), Serug (d. 2049), and Terah (d. 2083).¹⁹ The implication of Gen 11:31 is that Terah took Abram, Lot, and Sarai with him, and that his older relatives were left behind in Ur of the Chaldeans even though this fact is not explicitly mentioned in the text. The juxtaposition of the list and the narrative thus created a tension, and it is not impossible that some texts adapted the genealogical list to the new surroundings, avoiding a situation that surviving relatives would be left in Ur Kasdim at the time of Abram's departure from that city. The added years in the LXX (574 years), together with the added generation of Kenan 11 (130 years), postdate Abram's lifetime by 704 years. As a result, according to the LXX, Abram left Ur of the Chaldeans in 3389 A.M., at which time the other patriarchs had already died. Likewise, according to the SP, Abram left that city in 2324,²⁰ after the death of the other patriarchs according to that version's chronology.

The *common features* of the SP and the LXX in the two lists illustrate the development of the texts.

1. Delaying of two central events (flood, Abram's lifetime) by postdating the date of the fathering of the individual patriarchs.

18 On the other hand, according to Hendel, *Genesis*, 71, it was more problematic that the patriarchs were alive at the time of Abraham's birth.

19 By then Peleg and Reu had died (1996, 1997).

20 According to the SP, Terah died in Haran in the same year (11:32). According to Y. Zakovitch, "The Exodus from Ur of the Chaldeans: A Chapter in Literary Archeology," in *Ki Baruch Hu: Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Judaic Studies in Honor of Baruch A. Levine* (ed. R. Chazan et al.; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999), 429–439 the chronology of SP is preferable to that of MT. According to this scholar, MT increased Terah's years, wishing to create the impression that Terah was not yet ready to go to Canaan (p. 431).

2. Use of the exact same technique in the LXX in chapter 5 and the SP in chapter 11, of adding years to the fathering, especially round numbers (100), while diminishing the total number of years by the same amount, thus maintaining the same figures for the total life spans.
3. Combination of round and non-round numbers in the changed details.
4. Harmonizing textual features (see above).

Conclusions and Parallels

The differences between the three versions are recensional and not scribal, although there is no firm evidence. In my terminology recensional or editorial differences reflect a systematic change in a text in a certain direction. It seems that MT is not recensional in chapter 11, but may be so in chapter 5.²¹ On the other hand, the *Vorlage* of the LXX and SP probably revised MT or a similar text in both chapters in a certain direction. I thus posit two recensions (SP, LXX), and one text (MT) in chapter 11, and possibly three recensions in chapter 5.

These conclusions have major implications for the textual history of Genesis. Most differences between the ancient sources of Genesis are textual, but in chapters 5 and 11 they are recensional. For my own research this is a novelty. I had not yet recognized recensional traits in the texts of Genesis.

By way of appendix, I should mention that also elsewhere learned scribes were preoccupied with detailed exegetical-chronological calculations. Such changes were inserted under similar circumstances in textual witnesses and in post-biblical compositions. Thus the LXX changed the chronology of the flood of MT, adapting it to the solar calendar.²²

²¹ Our point of departure is that the LXX and SP, two versions that share elements, revised a text like MT, and not that MT revised a text like the LXX and SP. After all, the latter two texts reflect harmonizing elements, and furthermore, MT is problematic in chapter 11 because several patriarchs were still alive when Abraham left Ur of the Chaldeans. On the other hand, according to Hendel, *Genesis 1–11*, 62, MT is revisional also in chapter 5. Elaborating on his earlier work, *Genesis 1–11*, Hendel repeated in a more recent study that in chapter 5 three different recensions were at work: “A Hasmonean Edition of MT Genesis?: The Implications of the Editions of the Chronology in Genesis 5,” *HeBAI* 1 (2012): 1–17. On the other hand, several scholars claim that in chapter 5, MT reflects the original text of the list. See the following study that also quotes extensively from earlier views of Kuenen and Jepsen: B. Ziemer, “Erklärung der Zahlen von Gen 5 aus ihrem kompositionellen Zusammenhang,” *ZAW* 121 (2008): 1–18.

²² In MT and SP, the flood lasts one year and ten days, from the 17th day of the second month

Beyond the biblical manuscripts (see n. 22), 4Q252 and Jubilees likewise adhered to the solar calendar in the flood story in a different way, while filling in some chronological details not mentioned in MT.²³ Likewise, 4Qpap-BibChronology ar (4Q559), ascribed to the 3rd century BCE at latest by its editor, Puech, *DJD* XXXVII, 266–267 (who ascribes the Qumran copy to the first century BCE), reconstructs the biblical chronology from at least the period of Jacob until that of the Judges. It interprets extant biblical dates, and calculates additional events. Indeed, in the second century BCE, “an immense intellectual effort was expended during the Hellenistic period by both Jews and pagans to date creation, the flood, Exodus, building of the Temple.”²⁴ For example, in the beginning of the third century BCE, the Hellenistic Jewish author Demetrius was much involved with the intricacies of the biblical chronology, among other things, the flood.²⁵

(Gen 7:11) until the 27th day of the second month of the next year (8:14). On the other hand, in the LXX the flood lasts exactly one year, from 27th 11 to 27th 11 in the second year, the difference being between the lunisolar calendar of MT (354 days) and the solar calendar of the other sources (364 days).

- 23 4Q252 1 4 and Jubilees 5:23 calculate the flood as starting and ending at 17 11. See the analyses of T.H. Lim, “The Chronology of the Flood Story in a Qumran Text (4Q252),” *JJS* 43 (1992): 288–298; R. Hendel, “4Q252 and the Flood Chronology or Genesis 7–8: A Text-critical Solution,” *DSD* 2 (1995): 72–79; M.A. Zipor, “The Flood Chronology: Too Many an Accident?,” *DSD* 3 (1997): 1–4; R.H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or The Little Genesis* (London, A. and C. Black, 1902; repr. Jerusalem: Makor, 1972), 48–49; J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (CSCO 511; Louvain: Peeters, 1989), 36.
- 24 The quote is from the important study of B.Z. Wacholder, “Biblical Chronology in the Hellenistic World Chronologies,” *HTR* 61 (1968): 451–481 (451).
- 25 For details, see Wacholder, *ibid.*, 454. For the calculations of Berossus, see Wacholder, “Biblical Chronology” and the earlier studies of A.H. Sayce, “The Antediluvian Patriarchs,” *ET* 10 (1899): 352–353; J. Oppert, “Chronology,” *Jewish Encyclopedia* (New York/London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1903), 4:66–67.

The Textual Development of the Torah

When studying Scripture based on the complete spectrum of the textual witnesses, we have to turn to a long list of handbooks and text editions, since there is no single edition that provides the full text of these witnesses. The editions of the Hebrew University Bible Project and of the *Biblia Hebraica* series are very helpful, but they provide only a selection of the variant readings. For a comprehensive analysis of the textual evidence, we would have to study the full content of these texts in parallel columns.

The Scripture text is ancient, and we would like to know what this text looked like in early centuries. However, we have no tangible evidence for the Hebrew Bible before the Qumran copies that date to the middle of the third century BCE. All analyses of the text prior to that period are mere speculation, and while many aspects relating to the later periods are also speculative, they are at least based on some evidence.

When analyzing the textual transmission in these early centuries, we try to distinguish between facts and assumptions. The topic of the present investigation is the textual transmission of the Torah, but in order to examine this process effectively, we have to first broaden the analysis to all the Scripture books. The description below takes the textual evidence as its point of departure, and not any of the textual theories on the history of the Scripture text, such as the theory of the original text of de Lagarde, the theory of early parallel texts of Kahle, or the local texts theory. All these abstract theories revolve around general ideas and do not necessarily start with a study of the evidence itself. On the other hand, the following description attempts to be text-based, but is not necessarily more objective than any of the other ones.

The textual evidence from the last three centuries BCE shows that the individual Scripture books differ from each other in three categories; (1) the number of Hebrew copies that have been preserved for each book; (2) the number of textual branches that differ in content; and (3) the nature of the variation between the textual branches.

(1) In some biblical books, especially the Torah, Isaiah and Psalms, we are blessed with many early sources, whereas in other books the evidence is scant.¹ Differences in the number of copies of the separate Scripture books found in

¹ For details, see *TCHB*, 96–97.

the Judean Desert definitely reflect differing levels of interest in and use of these books. (2) Likewise, in some books we witness more textual branches than in others, differing in large as well as small details. We will attempt to understand the background of these differences as well as their nature. It has never been defined what exactly constitutes a textual branch, and obviously scholars will hold different views on this matter. I consider as a separate textual branch a text or a group of texts that has a distinct place in the stemma of a specific biblical book. (3) The differences in content between the textual branches and their number help us to better understand the diffusion patterns of the biblical books, transmitted in one or more groups of textual sources. Each group consists of one or more sources, which may be thought of as the branches of the textual transmission tree. Obviously, there is room for different views as to what exactly constitutes a textual branch. Likewise, some scholars hold different views on the number of textual branches in each book, while most scholars do not think along these lines at all and mainly comment on MT, that is, the text that for most of us is the central Scripture text.

The classification to be suggested here is subjective, since the textual data may be presented in different ways. The purpose of this classification is to better understand the internal relation between the textual sources as well as their relationship to earlier text forms. Its focus is the differences of types 2 and 3, that is, the number of textual branches and their nature, and not the differing numbers of copies found in the Judean Desert (1).

Different distribution patterns of texts emerge from this classification, ranging from a unified textual transmission to manifold textual branches. A rather unified textual tradition is visible in Judges,² Job,³ Ruth, Qohelet, Lamentations,⁴ Psalms,⁵ and probably also in Isaiah,⁶ since their main sources,

2 *Biblia Hebraica Quinta*, vol. 7, שפטים *Judges* (ed. N. Fernández Marcos; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 5, 12. In these pages, Fernández Marcos notes that the range of differences between the sources is minimal and, except for 77 instances, he always prefers the witness of MT. See my review in chapter 18 in this volume.

3 This assumption is based on the further assumption that the greatly deviating Greek version of Job reflects the translator's exegesis and not a deviating Hebrew text.

4 See R. Schäfer in *BHQ*, vol. 18, 17–20.

5 It is important to note that all textual witnesses, including the LXX, reflect the change of the Tetragrammaton to *elohim* in the so-called Elohist Psalter, Psalms 42–72 (book 2) and Psalms 73–83 (89) (book 3). This change must have been made in a very early copy of the Psalter, while the uncorrected copies, that constituted the base of all subsequent copies, have not been preserved.

6 In this book, there is possibly only one textual tradition, that of MT (including 1QIsa^b, and

MT+,⁷ the LXX and some Qumran fragments, are very close to one another. This situation shows that in the period for which we have textual evidence, the content and details of these books probably did not change much. It is not impossible that in an earlier period additional textual branches may have circulated in ancient Israel, but we consider this possibility unlikely since the text of some of these branches would have seeped through to later text forms. Possibly in these books tradition has preserved something like the original formulation even though that entity remains abstract.

In other books, the evidence branches out into two, three or a few more different traditions resulting from changes inserted in the text by different persons. To a great extent the number of the known textual branches is coincidental because of the vicissitudes of the textual transmission and of the preservation of ancient scrolls. Such textual branches are usually characterized by relatively large differences or by consistently occurring small differences. In a two-pronged textual tradition, MT+ and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX usually present different branches. For example, in the Greek book of Kings we notice extensive exegetical and textual activity pertaining to the chronological framework of the whole book and the content of 1 Kings. In my view, the Greek translation of that book was made from a rewritten form of MT or a similar text.⁸ In Jeremiah, the argument of the existence of two textual branches is supported by Qumran evidence: MT+ by 4QJer^{a, c}, and the LXX by 4QJer^{b, d}.⁹ Additional two-pronged textual traditions are found in Ezekiel, Proverbs, Esther, Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles.¹⁰ In Canticles, the combined evidence of MT+ and LXX differs sharply from that of 4QCant^{a, b}. The textual branches are distinguished on the basis of content differences, and accordingly the classification does not include orthographic and linguistic variations. For that reason, 2QJer, 1QIsa^a and the so-called Severus Scroll among others are not mentioned as separate branches.

many cave 4 scrolls), shared with the LXX. That version does not seem to reflect a divergent textual tradition, since the great majority of its deviations from MT are translational-exegetical. 1QIsa^a reflects a free orthographic-morphological variant of this tradition, and so does 4QIsa^c.

7 This symbol denotes the MT group (MT, Peshitta, Targumim, and the Vulgate). See *TCHB*, 29.

8 For example, the LXX portrays Solomon in a better light than MT, and it enhances his wisdom. For a detailed analysis, see my *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 283–305.

9 See my analysis in *Greek-Hebrew Bible*, 363–384.

10 For all these, see *TCHB*, 283–326.

It is important to stress that most of the large differences exemplified here reflect layers of exegesis of the earlier formulations of Scripture and therefore shed light on the development of the biblical literature. These differences thus do not pertain only to textual criticism in the technical sense of the word, but also to the understanding of the biblical literature. These developments are visible in textual sources copied in the last centuries before the common era, but they reflect rewriting processes of earlier centuries.

A more complex textual transmission is known for Joshua and Samuel. In Joshua, we meet three traditions: MT+, the LXX and 4QJosh^a, while in Samuel there may be more: MT, LXX and 4QSam^a, but probably also 4QSam^b and 4QSam^c.¹¹ However, by far the most elaborate textual picture is evidenced in the Torah, on which we shall focus next.

The textual development of the five books of the Torah differed from that of the other books, but this fact has escaped the attention of scholars¹² with the exception of an important study made by Kahle on the basis of the limited evidence that was available to him in 1915.¹³ The central position of the Torah becomes clear when the aforementioned three criteria are reviewed.

- (1) The percentage of copies of the individual Torah books found at Qumran (43 %) is twice as high as its relative position among the Bible books (22.5 %), and three times as high (62.5 %) in the other Judean Desert

11 It is unclear whether the Lucianic tradition in these books should be listed as reflecting a separate tradition.

12 For example, this topic is not dealt with by G.J. Brooke, "Torah in the Qumran Scrolls," in: *Bibel in jüdischer und christlicher Tradition, Festschrift für Johann Maier zum 60. Geburtstag* (ed. H. Merklein et al.; Bonn: Anton Hain, 1993), 97–120; S.W. Crawford, "The Qumran Pentateuch Scrolls: Their Literary Growth and Textual Tradition" in K. De Troyer and A. Lange, *The Qumran Legal Texts between the Hebrew Bible and Its Interpretation* (Peeters: Leuven/Paris/Walpole, MA, 2011), 3–16.

13 P. Kahle, "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes," *TSK* 88 (1915): 399–439; repr. in idem, *Opera Minora* (Leiden: Brill, 1956), 3–37. This study is quoted according to the page numbers of the latter publication. When Kahle wrote his study in 1915, he was familiar with less than half of the Torah texts known today, but even within the triad of witnesses of MT, LXX, and SP, he sensed that they reflected a special reality different from that of the other Scripture books. Some of the major conclusions of that study may not be acceptable, but Kahle opened up the area of the Torah for wide investigation and he had important insights into the nature of SP and the LXX. The time has now arrived for an analysis of the Torah texts based on a reinvestigation of the texts known to Kahle along with additional ones.

sites.¹⁴ Genesis and Deuteronomy were especially popular, not only among the Torah books, but also among all the Scripture books, along with Isaiah and Psalms. The popularity of the Torah is also shown by the large number of its Targumim (Onkelos and three different Palestinian Targumim: Pseudo-Jonathan, the Fragmentary Targum, and the Targum included in codex Neophyti). These manifold translations reflect the importance of the Aramaic versions of the Torah for rabbinic Judaism. For all other books, only a single Targum is known apart from the two Targumim of Esther.

- (2) In the number of textual branches in a book, the Torah is unique in that its branches are much more numerous than those of the other Scripture books. This large number indicates extensive exegetical activity visible in the many changes inserted in the Torah text, including completely rewritten segments, including completely rewritten segments. Such activity took place in spite of its special sacred character, and more likely, because of it (see below).
- (3) The Torah is unique in that it is the only Scripture book in which *textual* features are recognizable, namely harmonizations and variants replacing problematic readings, all of which reflect a free approach to the text.¹⁵

Thanks to the Qumran discoveries, we now are aware of many textual branches of the Torah, contained in groups of texts and individual texts amounting to no less than fifteen different text branches.¹⁶ In my view, all these texts, with the exception of the liturgical texts, enjoyed a status of authoritative Scripture texts:

¹⁴ For the figures, see Tov, *TCHB*, 96–98 and chapter 5 in this volume.

¹⁵ Jeremiah and Ezekiel also display recognizable features, namely a shorter text tradition (the LXX and two Qumran scrolls) as opposed to a longer one (MT and two Qumran scrolls), but these features were probably created at the literary development stage of the books.

¹⁶ All of these should be considered individual texts with the exception of the SP group (SP and the pre-Samaritan texts), which reflects a recension. The most characteristic readings of the SP group were created by substantial editorial changes inserted in the earlier text. For an analysis of these editorial changes, see M. Segal, “The Text of the Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Materia giudaica* 12 (2007): 5–20; Tov, *Hebrew–Greek Bible*, 57–70; Kartveit, *Samaritans*, 259–312; Zahn, *Rethinking*.

- (1) MT (proto-Masoretic texts):¹⁷ all the texts found at the Judean Desert sites except for Qumran are virtually identical to the medieval text of MT. Further, at Qumran we find many scrolls that are close to MT (MT-like texts). Within MT, the orthography of the Torah and the book of Kings is the most defective, that is, the most conservative as it resembled the writing in earlier centuries.¹⁸
- (2–4) The SP group has been preserved in three types of attestation, a group of so-called pre-Samaritan Qumran scrolls that resemble the SP, 4QNum^b ¹⁹ and the SP as known from medieval sources. The SP group is a popularizing textual offshoot of MT or a similar text. SP itself is a sectarian text, but when its slight sectarian layer is peeled off, we are faced with an early text, the likes of which were found at Qumran in the form of so-called pre-Samaritan scrolls. This textual branch removes difficulties from the text and also harmonizes details. Its editor duplicated many a verse and section due to a theological concern for completeness, while usually not changing or omitting verses.
- (5) The reconstructed Hebrew source of the LXX also reflects a free approach to the text. The Hebrew source of the LXX reflects the largest number of contextual small harmonizations among the textual witnesses,²⁰ more than the SP group, which until recently was considered to be the most harmonizing text.²¹ This feature is the

17 These are proto-Masoretic texts, since the term MT refers to texts that contain vocalization and cantillation signs.

18 Thus F.I. Andersen & A.D. Forbes, *Spelling in the Hebrew Bible* (BibOr 41; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986), 312–318. According to these scholars, the two books also contain the highest degree of internal consistency—in the Torah, this description applies especially to Exodus and Leviticus. A. Murtonen, “The Fixation in Writing of Various Parts of the Pentateuch,” *VT* 3 (1953): 46–53 notes that the Decalogue and the Book of the Covenant (Exodus 21–23) are more defective (and hence earlier) than the other segments of the Torah and, by the same token, he found differences between the various Pentateuchal sources.

19 4QNum^b is considered a separate branch of the pre-Samaritan texts as it also often agrees with both the SP and the LXX.

20 A large number of such harmonizations are also found in the pre-Samaritan texts 4QExod-Lev^f, 4QNum^b, 4QRP^b, but since these texts are fragmentary, we have to be careful in our assessments. See chapter 27 in this volume.

21 See my studies “Textual Harmonizations in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy,” in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 271–282; and chapters 12 and 31 in this volume. The LXX of the Torah is judged here according to its well-defined harmonizing pluses. In other details, the LXX has no

most prominent among the textual features of the Hebrew source of the LXX.

- (6–10) Five exegetical Torah scrolls bearing the somewhat misleading name of a nonbiblical composition, 4QRP^{a–e}, display a very free approach to the biblical text. They contain a running biblical text intertwined with small and large exegetical additions such as an expanded Song of Miriam, not paralleled in any other source.²²
- (11–14) Four (“non-aligned”) scrolls differing from the other texts in small details are not exclusively close to any of the mentioned texts:²³ 4Q[Gen-]Exod^b, 11QpaleoLev^a,²⁴ 4QDeut^c.^h It is mainly a sign of our ignorance that we do not know where to place these texts in the *stemma*. They do not depend on MT, but they do not differ much from that text.
- (15–18) In this context, we also mention four sources that do not contain pure biblical texts. These are liturgical texts, two of which were published as biblical texts (4QDeut^j.^{kl}). Most of these sources reflect a very free and harmonizing approach to the text: two different textual branches of *tefillin* and *mezuzot* from the Judean Desert,²⁵ Papyrus

specific features except for the chronologies in Genesis 5 and 11, the different sequence of the verses in Genesis 31, and the greatly deviating version of Exodus 35–40. In Genesis 5 and 11, the LXX has a secondary character, while the situation in the other chapters is unclear. See chapter 15 in this volume.

- 22 The cluster of the 4QRP texts approach their *Vorlagen* freely. Their freedom comes to light in various ways: two texts (4Q158 and 4Q364) share their editorial approach with SP, but not the harmonizing tendencies. Some of these texts rearrange the subject matter according to common themes (the various *Sukkot* laws and the two laws of the daughters of Zelophehad are combined), which may be considered a harmonizing editorial principle. See my analysis in *DJD XIII*, 187–196.
- 23 Because of their fragmentary condition, not all the Qumran texts that are probably non-aligned are included in this list. Probable candidates are: 4QGen^k; 4QExod^d, covering Exod 13:15–16 and 15:1, and thus omitting the narrative sections 13:17–22 and ch. 14, possibly containing an abbreviated Exodus text; 4QDeut^g, in some ways close to the LXX; 5QDeut.
- 24 See my study “The Textual Character of the Leviticus Scroll from Qumran Cave 11,” *Shnaton* 3 (1978): 238–244 (Heb. with Eng. summ.).
- 25 4QPhyl A–K, B–G, J, XQPhyl 3, and 4QMez A (probably all reflecting the same textual tradition); 4QPhyl N (Deuteronomy 32). For XQPhyl 3, see Y. Yadin, *Tefillin from Qumran* (*X Q Phyl 1–4*) (Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 1969), 27–29, 40–41. These *tefillin* differ from the MT-type *tefillin* and *mezuzot* represented by 4QPhyl C, D, E, F, R, S. See my study “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran,” in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 27–41.

Nash of the Decalogue from Egypt, and two liturgical Qumran texts that contain the same pericopes as the *tefillin* (4QDeut^j, k¹, n).²⁶ In these texts, harmonization, including the addition of small pericopes, is the main textual-editorial feature.²⁷ These texts probably carried authority as liturgical texts, but not as Scripture texts.

Incidentally, this classification does not include texts whose major deviation from the others is in their scribal character. Thus, many texts copied according to the so-called Qumran Scribal Practice²⁸ reflect an orthography and morphology that diverge widely from the other texts. This practice is best known from 1QIsa^a, but is reflected also in several Torah scrolls: 1QDeut^a, 4QExod^b, 4QNum^b, 4QDeut^j, k¹, k², m, 4QRP^a, b, c (4Q158, 364, 365).

Due to several uncertainties,²⁹ no precise number can be listed for the textual branches in the Torah, but it is probably around 15, and much larger than the 1–3 branches in the other books. In any event, the special sacred nature of the Torah, accepted by all, did not prevent its exegetical-literary and textual development as reflected in its widely divergent textual branches from the third century BCE onwards. In our modern eyes, the opposite may have been expected, namely that the special sanctity of the Torah would create a conservative approach of not allowing any changes in the text, as reflected in *b. t. Qiddushin* 30a: “The ancients were called *soferim* because they counted every letter in the Torah.” However, this statement reflects a time much later than that of the Qumran scrolls and it pertains only to the proto-Masoretic manuscripts. This Talmudic dictum shows that our modern thinking is often wrongly influenced by the character of only one segment of the transmission history of the Pentateuchal text, namely the proto-Masoretic tradition.

This description leads to the follow-up question why so many textual branches have been created in the Torah and not in the other books. In my view,

26 4QDeut^j contains sections from Deuteronomy 5, 8, 10, 11, 32 and Exodus 12, 13; 4QDeut^{k¹} contains sections from Deuteronomy 5, 11, 32.

27 The liturgical character of 4QDeut^j is supported by its small size. See Tov, *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 37. Note further that both 4QDeut^j and 4QDeutⁿ start with Deut 5:1 and continue until the beginning of chapter 6. Both texts also contain a fragment that covers 8:5–10. See Eshel, “4QDeutⁿ,” 151.

28 1QDeut^a, 4Q[Gen]Exod^b, 4QNum^b, 4QDeut^j v–xii, 4QDeut^{k¹}, 4QDeut^{k²}, 4QDeut^m.

29 The following uncertainties should be taken into consideration: (1) the SP group is counted as three and not as two or one unit(s), see n. 16; (2) the exact number of the liturgical branches is unknown; (3) four “non-aligned” texts were singled out, but their number could have been larger.

this situation was due to the popularity it enjoyed because of its special sanctity.³⁰ The very act of inserting changes into each new copy of a Torah scroll,³¹ often creating a new textual branch, was acceptable in early times. In a way, each scribe created a new version of the Torah, which was equally as authoritative as its predecessors. Among the known textual sources, only MT and a few additional (non-aligned) scrolls (11–14) disallowed such changes, at least after the mid-third century BCE, from which time the oldest scrolls are known.

The popularity of the Torah also brought about the creation of many new literary works, the so-called rewritten Bible compositions that reworked the stories and some legal segments of the Torah: *Jubilees*, *Enoch*, 4–11QTemple, 4QApocryphon of Moses and many additional Qumran compositions. These new compositions created additional textual entities in addition to those of the direct text witnesses. As a rule, the biblical quotations in these texts were not based on MT, but on the popularizing pre-Samaritan text tradition and the Hebrew source of the LXX, as is visible in 4QTest,³² 4QComm Gen A (4Q252), 4–11QTemple,³³ *Jubilees*,³⁴ and possibly the Genesis Apocryphon (probably).³⁵ Furthermore, it is significant that two of the exegetical texts, 4QRP^a (4Q158) and 4QRP^b (4Q364), reflect this tradition as well. The Qumran evidence of the Scripture texts does not show a preponderance of these pre-Samaritan texts since the textual tradition that was close to the proto-MT was more central for the Qumranites. On the other hand, the liturgical texts were probably based on MT, but this cannot be proven conclusively.

In the light of the textual development of the Torah, it is noteworthy that the popularity and frequent use of Isaiah and Psalms, representing literary genres different from the Torah, did not create diverging text branches. Probably the

30 See chapter 15 in this volume.

31 In light of this, it is noteworthy that the copying procedures of the Torah were virtually identical to those of the other biblical books and all the nonbiblical books. See *Scribal Practices*, 99–103, 108–118.

32 In this sectarian text, each of the biblical sections reflects a different textual pattern: Exod 20:21 (a pre-Samaritan text combining MT Deut 5:28–29 and 18:18–19 as in SP), Num 24:15–17 (undetermined character), and Deut 33:8–11 (very close to the non-aligned scroll 4QDeut^b).

33 See the studies quoted in chapter 14, notes 41 and 42. I consider the *Vorlage* of this scroll “non-aligned,” while Schiffman emphasizes the link between the LXX and the Temple Scroll.

34 See chapter 14, notes 45–47.

35 See J.C. VanderKam, “The Textual Affinities of the Biblical Citations in the Genesis Apocryphon,” *JBL* 97 (1978): 45–55.

scribes of these books did not feel at ease to rewrite Isaiah's prophecies or the Psalm literature, while other scribes dared touching the stories of the Torah.

A description of the features of the textual branches of the Torah allows us to better understand the relation between them and to compose a genealogical tree (*stemma*) that graphically displays these relations.³⁶ After all, we often try to express an opinion on the relation between ancient texts as background material for the exegetical and textual comparison of these texts, while not necessarily pronouncing a judgment on the so-called original text(s) of Hebrew Scripture. At the crown of the stemma stand the sources that do not display secondary features, namely (1) MT and a few fragmentary (non-aligned) texts that stand by themselves (11–13). Rather unexpectedly, contextual harmonization becomes the main criterion for characterizing the texts.³⁷ These harmonizations appear more in the Torah than in the other books, not because these books provide fewer occasions for harmonization, but because the scribes of the Torah scrolls endeavored to create what they considered to be near-perfect copies of the most sacred book of all.

All other texts branched off from MT or a similar text. The pre-Samaritan texts (2–4) and the Hebrew source of the LXX (5) are often closely related as they shared many harmonizations and other remarkable secondary readings.³⁸ Presumably the common ancestor of these two textual traditions branched off from MT or a similar text. The SP itself developed that text further away from its source than the LXX. At a later stage, the exegetical copies of 4QRP (6–10) branched off from MT and the pre-Samaritan texts. The liturgical texts (15–18),

36 A different type of *stemma* is presented by Lange, *Handbuch*, 173. Among the leading ideas of that *stemma* that differ from our own reconstruction are: (1) the LXX preceded MT; (2) SP preceded MT; (3) the LXX and SP are not positioned in close vicinity; (3) 4QDeut^a is not positioned close to the LXX. In determining proximity between textual sources, often common mistakes (“Leitfehler”) are emphasized. However, in my view, in the case of Hebrew Scripture too few sources have been preserved in order to make this argument a sound principle. Another *stemma* that differs from my own is presented in N. Jastram, “A Comparison of two “proto-Samaritan” Texts from Qumran: 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QNum^b,” *DSD* 5 (1998): 264–289 (266). In this *stemma* MT, SP, the LXX, and the pre-Samaritan texts appear at the same distance from the assumed original text. Yet another stemma of the text of Exodus is offered by R.S. Hendel, “Assessing the Text-critical Theories of the Hebrew Bible after Qumran,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. T.H. Lim & J.J. Collins; Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 281–302 (299).

37 Thus already E. Eshel, “4QDeut^a.” The importance of this textual and literary criterion is also stressed much by D.M. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 90–98.

38 See chapter 27 in this volume.

authoritative as liturgical texts but not as Scripture, probably also branched off from MT. The place in the stemma of the non-aligned texts (4Q[Gen-]Exod^b, 11QpaleoLev^a,³⁹ 4QDeut^{c,h}) is unclear. They are sometimes inferior to MT, but often not, and there is insufficient evidence to present them as offshoots of MT.

In this way we are able to sketch in great lines the development of the textual witnesses of the Torah, Surprisingly or not, in the Torah the proto-Masoretic texts stand at the top of the *stemma*. In my view, the proto-Masoretic manuscripts derived from a single copy or a very closely-knit tradition. Most other texts branched off from that tradition or a similar one, and their secondary features are often visible in their harmonizing character. E. Eshel had a premonition of the importance of this development when naming a group of Hebrew texts "harmonistic."⁴⁰ I go one step further in recognizing harmonizing tendencies also in the LXX and in additional Hebrew texts.

In sum, the creation of a *stemma* of the textual branches of the Torah allows us to portray graphically the relation between the ancient texts as a basis for the description of their development. The number of textual branches of the Torah was much more extensive than that of the other books due to both its popularity and special sanctity. This sanctity thus did not prevent the textual and exegetical development of the Torah literature. The popularity of the Torah gave rise to a large number of textual branches, with almost all of them, apart from MT and a few additional texts, bearing secondary features.

It is important to remember that the value judgments expressed in the *stemma* do not necessarily have implications for the praxis of textual criticism. Any one of the ancient texts may contain original readings, even manuscripts that are considered secondary in comparison with MT. When reviewing the various texts in parallel columns, a comparison of their details becomes clearer. All these together compose a mosaic of the biblical texts that changes all the time in the wake of new information. However, we should voice a *caveat*. This study only concerns the Torah and the textual relations in the other books are different.

39 See the study quoted in n. 24.

40 Eshel, "4QDeutⁿ."

A New Edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch

Review Article

A. Tal & M. Florentin, *The Pentateuch. The Samaritan Version and the Masoretic Version* (Hebrew; Tel Aviv: The Haim Rubin Tel Aviv University Press, 2010) vii + 765 pp. ISBN: 978-965-7241-43-1. NIS 149.

The Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) contains the text of the Torah written in a special version of the early Hebrew script that was preserved for centuries by the Samaritan community. SP contains a few ideological elements that form a thin layer added to an otherwise non-sectarian early text, very similar to so-called pre-Samaritan texts found at Qumran. Scholars are divided in their opinion on the date of creation of the Samaritan text. Often, the pre-Samaritan texts and SP are together named the SP group. The SP group differs from the other biblical texts (among them MT) in many details. Research is still underway concerning the textual status of SP, because its exact relationship to the similar Qumran texts and the LXX is in need of refinement.¹

The appearance of a new edition of SP is an important event for the scholarly world. From now onwards, SP can be studied with renewed vigor and advancements can be made towards its understanding. Several other editions preceded the present one, starting with the Paris Polyglot (1629–1645):

The first of the modern critical editions, by A.F. von Gall, *Der hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner*, vols. I–V (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1914–1918; repr. Berlin, 1966), presents an eclectic reconstruction of the original text, accompanied by an apparatus of variant readings. The edition, based on many manuscripts but not all those known at the time, is detailed and accurate, but the reconstructed text is artificially close to MT because von Gall often chose readings that were identical to MT.

A. and R. Sadaqa, *Jewish and Samaritan Version of the Pentateuch: With Particular Stress on the Differences between Both Texts* (Tel Aviv/Jerusalem: Reuven Mas, 1961–1965). The text of the first four Pentateuchal books is based on “an old Samaritan manuscript from the eleventh century,” while that of Deuteronomy

1 See chapter 27 in this volume.

is based on the Abisha' scroll. It presents the text of MT and SP in parallel columns with typographical emphasis on the differences between them.

A. Tal, *The Samaritan Pentateuch, Edited According to MS 6 (c) of the Shekhem Synagogue* (Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects 8; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1994) = Tal 1994. This diplomatic edition of manuscript Shechem 6 (1204 CE) was considered the central critical text of SP until the appearance of the edition under review. Tal 1994 also forms the base of a module of SP included in the *Accordance* computer program. This module takes into consideration the Samaritan reading tradition as recorded by Ben-Hayyim, LOT, not in the text itself, but in the morphological analysis that lies at the base of the search facilities.

The edition under review, by A. Tal and M. Florentin (= T-F), both of Tel Aviv University, presents an improved edition of manuscript Shechem 6 together with an extensive introduction and several appendixes. As in Tal 1994, the new edition presents the text of that manuscript, which "contains a greater part of the Torah than the other manuscripts" (p. 47). The text is presented as a running text unlike the Tal 1994 edition, which as a diplomatic edition of its base manuscript included somewhat misleading square brackets in places where missing elements in the main manuscript were supplemented by other sources. The present edition likewise supplements the missing information from other ancient sources, but leaves no notation in the text itself. It alerts the reader to these missing elements in a list on p. 754. As in Tal 1994, the new edition does not have a critical apparatus of variants representing other manuscripts of SP. T-F preferred a diplomatic to an eclectic edition because of the inability to choose between orthographic variants. This view does not imply that T-F reject the idea of one central Samaritan text. They would probably consider the oral tradition as such a central text, represented by different types of spellings, even by the same scribe.

One of the main laudable features of T-F is the clarity with which it presents the differences between SP and MT (the latter probably represents the Leningrad codex, although this has not been specified on p. 43). These two texts are printed on facing pages with typographical emphasis on the differences between them (in fact, the clarity of these differences, now presented in gray on the SP page, could have been improved even further had they been printed in bold type, as may have been the original intention [p. v of the English summary: "bold-face print"]). Plus elements of SP are indicated in the MT page with elegant omission signs, opposite the editorial additions of SP. E.g. in Exodus 7-11, the page of MT presents empty spaces.

The conventions used in the diplomatic presentation of the base manuscript are explained on pp. 50-51. The edition includes all the unusual spellings of

manuscript Shechem 6, listed also in an appendix on pp. 755–757 (e.g. נשבא instead of נשבה in Exod 14:14). Superscript letters and corrections in manuscript Shechem 6 are not included in the edition itself, but instead are included in a special appendix on pp. 746–753. By the same token, the scribal signs of the manuscript are not included in the edition (see p. 51). The diplomatic presentation includes the indication of the paragraph divisions with a paragraph sign (see p. 56) named *qiṣṣah* (a combination of colons or sometimes two dots and a long hyphen), but with no signs in the middle and at the end of verses. A major break is indicated by a space extending from the *qiṣṣah* sign at the end of the paragraph to the end of the line.

This is a precise and very helpful tool for the student of SP, for all specialists in textual criticism, and students of the Hebrew language. We will now turn to the aspect that the authors consider to be one of the main tasks of their edition (p. 51), viz., the emphasis on the differences between MT and SP, a task in which they succeeded very well. All the differences between these two sources can be viewed easily by comparing the details on the facing pages, while, in addition, T–F highlight those differences that they consider important. This highlighting provides far fewer details than the traditional number of 6,000 differences between MT and SP. That figure is based on the list produced by B. Walton, E. Castellus, and J. Lightfoot in Walton, *Polyglotta* (London, 1657), VI, IV.19–34 on the basis of now outdated editions. I calculated the total number of these differences as 7,000 on the basis of the SP module in *Accordance*, which is more or less identical to the text of T–F.

T–F describe the character of the highlighted details as “intentional changes” (p. 25), following the very distinction between intentional and unintentional changes introduced by Ben-Hayyim, *LOT*, vol. 5 (1977), 2–3. The intentional changes in SP in language and content receive major attention in this edition and are analyzed on pp. 28–38, and again on pp. 51–56 of the introduction, where T–F describe the nature of the edition. On p. 51, they are named “real variants ... that is, differences based on the intentional editing of SP.” Among the intentional changes highlighted on the SP page, T–F count these groups (pp. 28–38):

1. Linguistic changes of the earlier text, such as the removal of unusual morphological forms in MT, e.g. וחיתו הארץ/SP וחית הארץ (Gen 1:24), or syntactical structures, e.g. נשא ... הארץ/SP נשאה ... הארץ (Gen 13:6). Incidentally, not all forms exemplified for this group in the introduction are highlighted in the edition itself. Thus, the morphological difference between MT אל תירא and SP מרדה (Gen 46:3) should have been highlighted according to p. 29.

The replacement of MT נער in SP by נערה in Gen 24:14, 16, 28 (see p. 29) is not indicated in the edition.

2. Content editing, subdivided into (a) Logical arrangement of the text, e.g. the supplying of content to the missing phrase in Gen 4:8 “Cain said to his brother Abel. And when they were in the field,” where SP added “Let us go to the field” after “Abel.” Likewise, Gen 47:21 MT “And as for the population, *he transferred them to the cities*” changed in SP to “And as for the population, *he enslaved them to servitude*.” (b) Harmonizing changes, especially additions, e.g. Gen 7:2 “a male (literally: *a man*) and his mate (literally: *his wife*),” changed in SP to: “male and female.” (c) Apologetic changes, e.g. ארור אפם “*cursed be their anger*” changed in SP to אדיר אפם “*mighty was their anger*” (Gen 49:7). This group is probably the most problematic among the sub-categories of the assumed changes. (d) Ideological Samaritan changes, especially regarding the place of worship.

While “changes” of this type (T–F do not consider all of them to be “differences,” see below) were highlighted, the majority of the SP readings were not highlighted. These are the “unintentional changes” of SP, forming the majority of the differences between the two texts (p. 25), comprising two categories (1) orthography and (2) morphology. In the words of T–F, these changes do not display “the intentional editing” of SP (p. 51).

- (1) Thus, in Genesis 49, spelling variants of SP in fifteen words are not graphically highlighted. Only orthographical differences that have content implications have been highlighted on the SP page. I presume that T–F would count the highlighting of נטע/נטע (Num 24:6) to be such a case. This procedure also implies the lack of marking of the special endings of nouns with ה־, which are replaced in SP with ו־.
- (2) Morphological differences may involve the conjugations of the verb and different word patterns, as exemplified in detail on pp. 25–28, such as the removal of the apocopated future. In this group, we note the change of MT ירב to SP ירבה (Gen 1:22), which is not highlighted in the edition (see p. 26). Further examples of categories that are not highlighted are: lengthened futures of MT replaced by regular ones, e.g. MT ואברכה /SP ואברך (Gen 12:3); apocopated future forms of verbs *primae yod* replaced in SP by regular ones (e.g. ויולד changed 33 times in SP to ויליד in Genesis 5).

T–F are well aware that their binary classification of intentional/unintentional changes differs from previously suggested analyses of the differences between SP and MT (p. 25). Other classifications are more detailed, but T–F preferred the

system suggested by Ben-Ḥayyim. The validity of T–F’s system depends on this distinction, on which I submit a few reactions:

1. According to this reviewer, T–F’s argument about the presence or lack of intentions has not been proven. It is very unlikely that all the differences (not “changes” as in T–F) in orthography and morphology are unintentional, nor is it likely that all the assumed “changes” described as intentional were indeed intended. Note that this group includes most interchanges of consonants, such as the previously mentioned interchange of אפם and אדיר אפם in SP (Gen 49:7), most of which are not intentional, but rather are exponents of the scribal transmission.

It remains very difficult to prove the intention behind the occurrence of different noun patterns in SP. According to T–F, the different patterns לָמַס עבד/SP למוס עבד (Gen 49:15), and בלהטיהם/SP בלטיהם (Exod 8:14) are intentional. But why is the systematic, albeit inconsistent, removal of the *nun* in future forms of the type of ישמעון (e.g. Exod 4:9) not intentional?

2. The distinction between these two groups depends on one’s view on the nature of SP. According to T–F, all the SP readings are in the nature of “changes” made to MT, and when making this claim, they exclude the possibility that SP contains early readings that did not change readings of MT or of a text like MT. In accordance with this view, T–F’s analysis disregards the presence of similar readings found in Qumran manuscripts, thus not considering the possibility that the readings of SP are not changes made to MT or to a text like MT, but rather are early readings. Many of these early readings would indeed have changed a text like MT, but they were not “changes” made to SP but to the scroll on which SP was based.
3. The limited notation of the differences between SP and MT has its drawbacks, since it disregards major agreements between SP on the one hand and LXX and important Qumran manuscripts on the other. The lack of these notations does not constitute a major problem, since a text edition does not form the end of the research process, but rather is the basis for further research. However, this approach exposes the weaknesses of the binary classification of the variants that underlies this edition. Furthermore, although SP is compared to MT, it is often closer to the pre-Samaritan Qumran manuscripts than to MT.² Likewise, in harmonizing pluses, recognized by T–F (pp. 32–34), SP is closer to the LXX than to MT. T–F chose not to include

2 See chapter 28 in this volume.

these data as theirs is not a full-fledged textual edition, but these facts have to be taken into consideration when evaluating the classification offered by this edition.

While I disagree with elements in T-F's classification in the introduction, I consider the edition an excellent research tool. The major advantage of the new approach of T-F is in the separation between two groups in the introduction, and their separate treatment in the notation in the edition itself. The very division into intentional and unintentional variations is more subjective than the authors would be ready to admit. If I were to make a binary distinction between two groups of variants, I would probably end up with two groups of variants similar in scope to those indicated by T-F, but I would probably characterize them as *important/unimportant* for the text-critical analysis of SP. This type of binary division, parallel to other critical apparatuses, is admittedly subjective, but the highlighting of T-F is equally subjective.

I do not think that T-F should have stopped here in their separation of two types of readings. In addition, the information on the orthographic and grammatical variants could have been made available to the readers who would have enjoyed benefiting from the vast experience of the editors in this area. Technically, it would have been possible somehow to indicate these differences between the two traditions. The reader needs this type of guidance, as the introduction shows that orthography should not be taken at face value since the reading tradition must also be taken into consideration.

This brings us to the representation in the edition of the oral tradition of the Samaritans, heralding a major advancement in *Editionstechnik* of SP. The Samaritan dimension of the SP edition has been greatly enhanced by T-F, both experts in the oral transmission of that text. The importance of the recording of the oral tradition has been known for a long time through the groundbreaking work of Ben-Ḥayyim, but this information has not yet been included in a text edition that records the differences between the Samaritan and Masoretic readings. A start was made in the first part of a promising monograph by S. Schorch.³ T-F included the part of the oral tradition that is relevant for the use of SP in textual criticism in the form of notes on the running text in an extensive appendix on pp. 621–736, to which the Samaritan page in the text edition refers by way of a little circulus added to the text words. Thus, T-F do not provide the full reading of SP, but only those instances in which it differs

3 S. Schorch, *Die Vokale des Gesetzes: Die samaritanische Lesetradition als Textzeugin der Tora*, 1. *Das Buch Genesis* (BZAW 339; Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2004).

from MT. Schorch 2004 followed a similar notation system, not accompanied by a complete text edition. The attentive reader notes immediately that the two monographs interpret Ben-Hayyim's transcription differently. Schorch records many more differences between MT and SP, and when the two monographs remark on the same word, they often interpret the transcription differently. Schorch also records his preference for the vocalization of either MT or SP (usually: MT), and he records the evidence of the other ancient sources such as the LXX separately.

In the introduction (pp. 45–46), T–F remind the reader that we should not blindly follow the written tradition of the consonants in SP, but should always be aware of the reading tradition as it sometimes goes against the consonants. Thus, a presumed difference between MT שמה and SP שם is not a real difference, since the pronunciation of both שם and שמה in SP is always *šamma* (p. 46). Furthermore, even when words are written with the same consonants in MT and SP, the reading of the Samaritans may actually be based on a different vowel pattern. Some of these differences are significant. Thus, in Exod 15:4, MT טָבַעוּ was read by SP as טָבְעוּ (p. 673). Likewise, in Gen 27:5, בְּדִבֶּר was read by SP as בְּדִבֵּר. Each of these cases is indicated in the SP edition alerting to the full information.

We should add, however, that the Samaritan oral tradition is not the only possible way of understanding the consonants of SP, just as the Masoretic vocalization is not the only way of understanding the consonants of MT. T–F stress several times that the purpose of their edition is the comparison of SP with MT since SP is embraced by the Samaritan community, is rendered into Samaritan Aramaic and Arabic translations, and quoted in the early Samaritan literature. Accordingly, the reader now has full insight into the Samaritan dimension of SP.

However, the content of SP was not always Samaritan. T–F are aware of the Qumran texts that resemble SP (p. 23 and the very long note 31 on pp. 23–24; p. 33 and n. 53 on p. 33), but this dimension is not taken into consideration sufficiently in the introduction, nor are these texts reflected in the edition. Actually, T–F's approach to these early texts is unclear, although it is possibly explained by their opinion (p. 23, n. 31) that SP in its present form was finally shaped only in the Middle Ages. The assumption of the late crystallization of SP is probably correct, definitely with regard to the reading of the Samaritans, which is central to this edition. However, the main ingredients of SP existed already in antiquity, as viewed from a comparison of SP with the Qumran texts and the harmonizing elements in the LXX. Of course, we do not possess any SP manuscripts dating from the period between the turn of the era and the Middle Ages, but the Samaritan *targum* is close to SP (although T–F, 39–41

mention a few small differences), and therefore its date can be pushed back a few centuries.

The omission of consideration of the non-Samaritan dimension is not an oversight, but is based on the conviction held by the master of Samaritan studies, Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, that the pre-Samaritan Qumran scrolls were not relevant to SP.⁴ At the same time, Ben-Ḥayyim realized that SP is not a reflection of a special Samaritan language or dialect, but of the Hebrew of the Second Temple period, parallel to rabbinic Hebrew and the language of the Dead Sea Scrolls as opposed to the First Temple background of MT.⁵

The limiting of the recording of information to that of the Samaritan oral tradition presents a logical procedure, since SP is a Samaritan text. Furthermore, we have no solid information about the non-Samaritan reading of the consonantal text of SP in the 2nd century BCE. However, in my view, the oral tradition of SP is not the only way of understanding the consonants of SP.

My view about some of T-F's insights in the introduction to the edition may be right or wrong, but even if I am right, the nature of the edition is not at stake. This is an excellent research tool, incorporating major innovations embodied in the Samaritan reading tradition.

4 Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, "Comments on the Use of the Term 'Proto-Samaritan,'" in *Language Studies v–vi* (Heb.; Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1992): 13–23.

5 Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, "Traditions in the Hebrew Language, with Special Reference to the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. Rabin & Y. Yadin; ScrHier 4; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965), 200–214; idem, *LOT*, 5.2–3.

Biblia Hebraica Quinta, vol. 7, שפטים Judges

Review Article

Biblia Hebraica Quinta, vol. 7, שפטים Judges (ed. Natalio Fernández Marcos; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011). Pp. XXXII + 63 + 141*. ISBN 978-3-438-05267-4.

Judges may not be a very exciting book for text-critical study (see § 6 below), but the present volume is exciting because it is part of a very important editorial enterprise, the *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (*BHQ*), and because Fernández Marcos (= FM) produced a fine edition and commentary. In textual criticism, both the trees and the forest are important, and *BHQ* analyzes the trees enabling others to describe the forest, while in this case also the author himself shared some of his important insights with the readers. This volume provides a carefully produced critical text of Judges joined by an apparatus of variants in 63 pages, an introduction to the textual witnesses and to the system of recording in 39* pages, and a commentary of 102 pages on the decisions that FM had to take when constituting the critical apparatus. The textual commentary discusses in detail the difficult readings together with ample bibliographical references.

The Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Aramaic witnesses are briefly introduced on pp. 1*–12*. The author makes the following points, critically evaluated below:

- (1) As in all critical editions in the *Biblia Hebraica* series, codex Leningrad B19^A is the basis for the edition, diplomatically presented, except for its errors, which are corrected in the edition, e.g. 1:9 נָחַשׁ (with a superfluous *dagesh*) corrected to נָחַשׁ. As in the other volumes of *BHQ*, the appendix to the introduction lists the open and closed sections of codices L, C and A together with those of 1QJudges, differing among themselves in some 30 % of the instances (pp. 13*–15*). These section divisions are indicated in the edition with פ and ס, in conformity with the other editions, although the letter indications themselves are lacking in L. Understandably the edition follows the traditional section division of MT, also when it is inconsistent, as in 1:29–34. In these verses, the same content divisions are usually indicated with a ס, but after v. 29 with a פ. The stichometric arrangement of the Song of Deborah in *BHQ* follows that of L, close to A and C. In 2:1 and 7:5 all three manuscripts include a *pisqa' be-emša pasuq*, correctly

explained in the commentary as reflecting “an old verse or paragraph division” (p. 46*).

- (2) The Qumran fragments are extensively analyzed on pp. 5*–6* and fully covered by *BHQ* except for matters of orthography (thus בן[מי] in 4QJudg^b [4Q50] is not indicated in the edition in 21:21). The morphological variant מהמחללות in 21:23 in the same scroll (MT המחללות), somewhat imprecisely described as “orthography” on p. 6*, is included in the edition. A reading of 1QJudg in 9:4 is corrected on p. 6* of the introduction, but is strangely not corrected in the apparatus itself which now records a ghost entry. The most extensive deviation from MT in any of the scrolls is the omission of Judg 6:7–10 in 4QJudg^a. FM wisely decided to give full coverage to this minus in the introduction (p. 6*) and in the commentary (65*–66*). Incidentally, the careful reader will note that there is duplication between the two analyses and that some of the remarks on these verses in the introduction should have been moved to the commentary. The author’s own view of the shorter text is that it “reflects an earlier literary form of the book than the traditional texts” (p. 6*).
- (3) The author notes: “For the Greek book of Judges there still is no critical edition” (p. 6*). This statement should be corrected to read “no critical edition according to the Göttingen system,” for Rahlfs, *Septuaginta* is a full critical edition. In spite of some voices to the contrary I consider the evidence for the existence of two different translations very strong, separated in the Rahlfs edition as the text of codices A and B (with separate critical apparatuses). This analysis is supported by Barthélemy, *Devanciers*¹ claiming that the tradition of MS B of the LXX reflects the *kaige* recension. The implication of the research of Barthélemy and Bodine is that the *kaige* recension provides a full-fledged translation.
- (4) Although it is “very difficult to restore the OG <= Old Greek>” (p. 7*, bottom), the author quotes in the first place codex A for the LXX (p. 7*, top) or rather, the A-group (p. 8*), although FM does not go as far as naming this edition the OG. MS A is sometimes Hexaplaric, says FM (p. 8*), so that it is the group around that manuscript that should be taken as reflecting the OG. This is an important decision improving on *BHS* that has much to be commended. In the absence of a full Göttingen edition of Judges, FM lists his manuscript groups for the LXX on p. 7*. Among other things, he recognizes several OG readings in the Lucianic manuscript

1 This work (1963) is not quoted by FM, but he does quote the later study by W.R. Bodine, *The Greek Text of Judges: Recensional Developments* (HSM 23; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980).

tradition (p. 8*). In the introduction FM does not provide examples of such readings, nor in the apparatus itself, since the Lucianic tradition is not specified in the apparatus that limits itself to mentioning mere “Ms(s)” in a generalized way, as elsewhere in *BHQ*. The non-mentioning of Lucian in the case of early readings is problematic, as mentioned in §5 below. FM also recognizes ancient readings in the Old Latin version of the LXX (p. 8*).

- (5) The author’s insights in understanding the relations between the manuscripts of the LXX as described in the previous remark are not reflected in the apparatus itself, and probably this would not have been possible in the system of *BHQ*. The apparatus thus limits itself to the recording of G and G^{ms(s)} without further details. By the same token, FM does not note in the apparatus what the base is for his understanding of what constitutes the original form of the LXX, indicated in the apparatus as “G*.” Thus in 8:15 for MT וְשָׁא the apparatus records G* as reflecting MT. The reader has no premonition that this G* (OG) is actually a minority reading τοὺς ἄνδρας (not even mentioned in the Rahlfs edition) reflected in a single Greek manuscript and the Old Latin. When reading in *BHQ* τοὺς ἄρχοντας as the reading of “G-Mss” one has again no premonition that this is the reading not of some manuscripts, but of virtually all manuscripts. The data are not hidden, since they are mentioned in the textual commentary, which is absolutely necessary, since only it provides the full evidence. The preference of *BHQ* for this reading, as acceptable as any other choice, is documented in the textual commentary, referred to by a symbol in the apparatus, although the wording of the commentary is not very convincing (“G* may be represented here by the reading of ms. 121 ...”). It remains unclear why the author preferred this ms. 121 and the Old Latin against all the Greek evidence especially since that reading may reflect a secondary adaptation to MT. The apparatus only notes that τοὺς ἄρχοντας reflects a Hebrew text different from MT. It is unclear from the wording of the apparatus whether FM would call this a variant (“via שר”), as indicated by the definition of “via” on p. xxvi. See below, §8.
- (6) FM makes a very important statement when claiming at the beginning of the edition (p. 5*): “The Masoretic text of Judges in its final form is a text relatively well preserved except for chapter 5. Most of M’s readings should be preferred over the variant readings of the versions or a good number of conjectures ... The fragments of *Qumran* are scarce. Most of them prove to be secondary in relation to M.” With regard to the beginning of this statement, I do not think we possess any criteria in order to know whether MT has or has not been preserved well. We also do not know

much about the earlier stage of the book preceding that of the textual evidence. It would therefore be more to the point to say: There is not much variation between the textual witnesses of the book of Judges, and usually the MT preserved an acceptable/good/preferable text. The second part of the statement goes as far as saying that in Judges our best text is that of MT, and that the other sources do not offer many details that are to be preferred to MT. Indeed on p. 12*, FM states that the “Peshitta and the Targum are literal translations of M except for chapters 5 and 11:39 ...” In FM’s view there thus are merely two sources in Judges, MT (+ Peshitta, Targum, and Vulgate) and the LXX. I agree, but differ in nuances, as discussed below, §7. FM could have mentioned here also 4QJudg^a, whose evidence he values highly (see §2 above).

FM’s statement in the introduction can be tested against the apparatus itself in which only a very small percentage of details is preferred to MT. There are no notes suggesting an “ins(ertion)” “transp(osition),” “del(etion),” “corruptions” (crpp), “hapl(ography),” or “ditto(graphy)” in MT. Such critical evaluations are only used for details in the versions (variants) and not for MT. Thus 6 readings in the versions are described as “hapl”; 8 readings in the LXX and one in V are named “gloss”; 12 readings in the versions are described as “homtel” and “homarc”; 1 case in S is described as metathesis; 22 readings in the versions are described as “harm”; 26 readings in the versions are named doublets (“dbl”); no less than 78 words in the versions, especially in the LXX, are described as “assimilation”; further, a variety of explanatory abbreviations is used to explain details in the translations and scrolls as secondary when compared with MT, such as “theol.” Compared with all these details, only in 77 details in Judges “pref” is used for variants in the versions and scrolls that are preferable to MT. In other words, variants that are preferable to MT are very scarce in Judges according to the *BHQ* edition.

All these evaluations mentioning “pref” refer to a Hebrew reading (variant) differing from the reading of MT mentioned in the lemma.² The variant is always included in a non-Masoretic source, usually reconstructed from an ancient translation. The purpose of the notations is to indicate that the variant reading is pref(erable) to the reading of MT. E.g. Judg 1:4 בידם MT V S T] ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ G θ’ || pref בידו see G θ’. In the sys-

2 Incidentally, the notation “pref” is not mentioned in the list of abbreviations and characterizations in the beginning of the book, but is included in the general Introduction to the series, preceding the volume of the Five Megilloth (Stuttgart, 2004).

tem of *BHQ* there is an element of imprecise information in notes of this type since the “preferred” reading is compared (“see”) with one or more ancient sources (in this case, G θ’), while in actuality it is *based* on these sources.

- (7) This edition is based on much thorough textual thinking since the author makes the following important statement on p. 8*: “Only in a few cases, as may be seen in the apparatus, can it be argued that the Vorlage of G was superior to that of M, except in ...” This is a statement that shows much thinking, and the present reviewer probably concurs. However, without giving examples, it seems to me somewhat exaggerated to claim that the *Vorlage* of the LXX was superior to MT only in “the special case of Judges 5” and the “omissions by homoioteleuton in M of 16:13–14 and 19:30.” These three examples are correctly evaluated, but it is hard to imagine that there are no superior readings elsewhere. For example, the commentary of 9:46 prefers a reading of the LXX to MT. The important plus of the LXX in 2:1 (Beth-El) is brushed aside in *BHQ* as a doublet. In 19:18 most scholars conceive of καὶ εἰς τὸν ὄλόν σου instead of MT יהוה בית as the original reading (for a discussion, see my *TCHB*, 238), reflecting ביתי that was understood by way of abbreviation as בית. On the other hand, in *BHQ* the reading of the LXX, discussed at length on p. 108*, is ascribed to “assim-v 29.” In a case like 20:1 ויברח וילך בארה—αὐτὸς ἐπορεύθη ἐν ὁδοῖ καὶ ἔφυσεν εἰς Παφᾶ how can we determine at all the original rendering? *BHQ* offers no guidance, but the Greek reading is not considered better than MT. The upshot of this discussion of an important aspect of this edition can only be expressed in the form of a general impression. Evaluation is a subjective process, and therefore this reviewer cannot claim that his view is more correct than that of FM. While I agree that in Judges, MT is probably our best textual source, I would probably find more readings in the LXX that are preferable to MT than FM has found. I would support this impression by an argument at the level of translation technique. FM admits: “G is a quite literal version of a text very similar, although not identical, to M.” (p. 9*). That being the case, one wonders why FM explained so many deviations from the LXX in MT as inner-translational features, such as “theol”, “assim”, “harm”, etc. Many of them could reflect Hebrew readings, some preferable to MT.
- (8) In assessing the text-critical value of renderings in the ancient versions, *BHQ* makes a helpful distinction between variants and renderings that are seemingly based on variants, but actually merely reflect the translator’s thinking process. The latter renderings mention the Hebrew words pre-

ceded by “via.” Thus in 1:15, גִּלָּת is rendered three times with λῦτρωσις, which is correctly described in the apparatus as “via גִּלָּת”, involving an imaginary silent *aleph*. This notation implies that the translator did not have this Hebrew reading in front of him, but created the translation by way of etymology. On the other hand, in other instances the use of “via” is unrealistic. Thus, in 1:22 אֵלֶּסֶל for בֵּית in the phrase בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל is described as “via בִּנְיָ.” However, at most this rendering can be described as an inner-Greek harmonization, but the present description is misleading, as the otherwise literal translator probably knew a variant בִּנְיָ. By the same token, in 2:20 ἐγκατέλιπεν for עָבְרוּ actually reflects a form of עָזַב and should not be described as “via עָזַב.” The same pertains to some forty additional instances of “via.” In this procedure, FM probably follows the *BHQ* system.

- (9) The exhaustiveness of the edition cannot be examined. Even the most comprehensive edition, that of the Hebrew University Bible Project, is subjective in its selection, and not always exhaustive. The discussion of exhaustiveness is therefore necessarily subjective. Readings of the LXX that are considered secondary by FM, and mentioned on p. 8* of the Introduction, could have been mentioned in the apparatus. This is a rather long list, and I am not certain that all these details should indeed be excluded from the edition. For example, the phenomena described as “doublets” by FM need not be excluded from recording, since they often reflect Hebrew doublets. FM only provides references, and it is not always clear to which details in the text he refers.
- (10) FM wisely quotes the Old Latin only when it disagrees with the LXX (p. 9*).
- (11) The system of *BHQ* has many advantages, as I asserted in my review of this fine edition.³ One of the innovations of *BHQ* is the understanding that certain variants reflect literary rather than textual differences. Such variants are indicated as lit(erary) and are not subjected to textual judgment. That the volume of Judges has no such notations of “lit” should not be held against FM, since possibly there are none. However, in light of FM’s positive view of the lack of Judg 6:7–10 in 4QJudg^b, FM should probably have indicated that instance as “lit,” since he recognized that this minus has literary importance (Introduction, p. 6*).

3 “The *Biblia Hebraica Quinta*: An Important Step Forward,” *JNSL* 31 (2005): 1–21. Revised version: *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 189–198.

This is a very fine and mature edition into which Fernández Marcos put much thinking. The data are presented in such a way that the reader can consult the evidence himself/herself, while disagreeing occasionally with judgments expressed in the edition.

PART 2

Qumran



The Sciences and the Analysis of the Ancient Scrolls: Possibilities and Impossibilities

The study of the Qumran scrolls is the study of fragments and sheets rather than that of complete scrolls. For example, 4QJer^a consists of fifty fragments covering parts, sometimes very minute, of sixteen chapters. 4Q509 consists of 313 fragments, and 4QSam^a has 346 fragments covering parts of fifty chapters. I have no idea how many fragments altogether have been found in the Qumran caves, but it must be a large number. Some scholars speak of 15.000 fragments for cave 4 alone,¹ while others estimate the total number of fragments as 10.000² or as many as 100.000.³ If we set the average number of fragments per scroll randomly at forty, we are dealing with 37.000 fragments covering 930 fragmentary scrolls. The actual number will remain unknown unless one dedicates many weeks to counting.

When dealing with a topic like the sciences and the ancient scrolls, scientists often forget that these fragments are parts, however minute, of once complete sheets, and that each medium-sized scroll consisted of a number of sheets. Each fragment constitutes an independent unit for a material investigation, to be supplemented by information included in other fragments deriving from the same sheet. Each sheet likewise forms an independent unit, not necessarily of the same nature as the sheet that is now stitched to it. Therefore, in the material analysis of the fragments it is necessary to know more about each sheet or the scroll as a whole. The scroll is the overriding unit, but since many scrolls are composed of different sheets, we have to base our remarks on these sheets. Single-column sheets like 4QTest (4Q175) and single-sheet scrolls are rare in Qumran. Most scrolls are composed of a number of sheets, seventeen in the case of the large Isaiah scroll.

Over the past five decades, the sciences have come to our aid in examining several material aspects of scroll fragments, their coverings, stitching material,

1 R. de Vaux, quoted by P. Benoit in *DJD* VI, v.

2 Thus S.R. Woodward et al., "Analysis of Parchment Fragments from the Judean Desert Using DNA Techniques," in *Current Research and Technological Developments in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995* (ed. D.W. Parry & S.D. Ricks; STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 215–238 (222).

3 J.T. Milik, oral communication.

etc. The first such study was that included in *DJD* I (1955), viz., examinations by Crowfoot of the linen textiles, some of which must have covered scrolls.⁴ Further, according to investigations made in 1958 and the early 1960s by Ryder on the one hand and Poole and Reed on the other,⁵ the leather scrolls found at Qumran were made mainly from skins of sheep and goats.⁶ A more detailed study of the scroll material mentioned the following four species: calf, fine-wooled sheep, medium-wooled sheep, and a hairy animal that was either a sheep or a goat.⁷

There are many ways in which the sciences helped or *could* help us to gain a better understanding of the scroll fragments and aid us in their reconstruction. The main areas are: (1) determining the date of the scrolls (based on the age of the skin and ink [?]), (2) determining whether fragments derive from the same sheet (Carbon-14, DNA research, the chemical composition of the skin and ink; follicle patterns in skins, and fibers in papyrus), (3) retrieving previously unreadable letters with the aid of advanced photographic techniques, (4) identifying fragments and determining the relation between fragments with the aid of computer-assisted research. At the same time, we should also be able to determine where these sciences are *unable* to help us.⁸

This study refers solely to the scientific examination of the fragments, and not to the identification and reconstruction on the basis of content. Further, it refers only to scientific aid in the reconstruction and understanding of the scrolls, and not to the contribution of these examinations to the archeology of Qumran or the understanding of life at Qumran. Thus, we do not deal with

4 G.M. Crowfoot in *DJD* I (1955), 18–38. The tests themselves were carried out under the direction of W.F. Libby at the University of Chicago in 1950.

5 M.L. Ryder, "Follicle Arrangement in Skin from Wild Sheep, Primitive Domestic Sheep and in Parchment," *Nature* 182 (1958): 1–6; J. Poole & R. Reed, "The Preparation of Leather and Parchment by the Dead Sea Scrolls Community," *Technology and Culture* 3 (1962): 1–26; repr. in *Technology and Culture: An Anthology* (ed. M. Kranzberg & W.H. Davenport; New York: Schocken, 1972), 143–168; *idem*, "A Study of Some Dead Sea Scrolls and Leather Fragments from Cave 4 at Qumran: Part I, Physical Examination; Part II, Chemical Examination," *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society, Scientific Section* 9/1 (1962): 1–13; 9/6 (1964): 171–182.

6 *Ibid.*, "Part I, Physical Examination," 1–13 (8).

7 M.L. Ryder, "Remains Derived from Skin," in *Science in Archaeology: A Comprehensive Survey of Progress and Research* (ed. D. Brothwell & E.S. Higgs; London: Thames & Hudson, 1963), 539–554.

8 For an earlier survey, see M. Broshi, "The Dead Sea Scrolls, the Sciences and New Technologies," *DSD* 11 (2004): 133–142.

ground-penetrating radar locating caves, examination of parasites in combs, Qumran skeletons, or pottery, nor do we deal with the study of metals, wood, glass, etc. The latter list of examinations is very important for many aspects of Qumran archeology and Qumran research, and sometimes also of scroll research, but does not contribute directly to the reading and reconstruction of scroll fragments, which is our immediate aim.

Over the past four decades, many types of scientific investigation have been carried out, providing help for the research of the scrolls.

This study focuses on the following areas:

1. Topics examined and results reached with the aid of the sciences
2. Some technical data about the scrolls
3. Scientific aid in the reconstruction of ancient scrolls: possibilities and impossibilities.

1 Topics Examined and Results Reached with the Aid of the Sciences

Individual scholars as well as groups of scholars⁹ advanced the scientific investigation of the scrolls in individual and collective publications dealing with the sciences.¹⁰ Progress has been made in the following areas.

1.1 *Dating the Scrolls*

1.1.1 Carbon-14

The first system used for dating scrolls was that of *paleography* (dating on the basis of the type of handwriting), and this is still our major resource for dating.¹¹ At the same time, at an early stage in the study of the scrolls, C-14

9 Note especially the Jerusalem "Taskforce for science and the scrolls" on behalf of the Orion Center at the Hebrew University.

10 Parry & Ricks, *Current Research* (n. 2 above); *Khirbet Qumrân et 'Ain Feshkha: Études d'anthropologie, de physique et de chimie* (ed. J.-B. Humbert & J. Gunneweg; NTOA.SA 3; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2003); *Qumran, the Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates, Proceedings of a Conference Held at Brown University, November 17–19, 2002* (ed. K. Galor, J.-B. Humbert, & J. Zangenberg; STDJ 57; Leiden: Brill, 2006); *Bio- and Material Cultures at Qumran: Papers from a COST Action G8 Working Group Meeting Held in Jerusalem, Israel on 22–23 May 2005* (ed. J. Gunneweg, C. Greenblatt, & A. Adri-aens; Stuttgart: Fraunhofer IRB, 2006).

11 For a summary of the paleographical dates given to the scrolls, see B. Webster, "Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert," in *DJD* XXXIX, 351–446.

examinations¹² of the skin and papyrus fragments became instrumental in determining their dates,¹³ usually corroborating paleographical dating.¹⁴ These examinations have been applied only to a small number of scrolls.¹⁵

The paleographical dates applied to the documents range from the fourth century BCE to the first century CE for the Jericho documents, from 250 BCE to 68 CE for the Qumran texts, from 150 BCE to 70 CE for the Masada texts, and from 75 BCE to 135 CE for the texts from Wadi Murabba'at, Naḥal Ḥever, and Naḥal Ṣeelim.

With the aid of a C-14 test, 1QIsa^a was dated to between 250 and 103 BCE (paleographical date: 125–100 BCE)¹⁶ and 11QT^a between 97 BCE and 1 CE (paleographical date: late first century BCE to early first century CE).¹⁷ However, there are also a few texts for which the paleographical and C-14 dates differ greatly. This pertains to 4QTQahat, C-14 dated to 385–349 BCE. This date is earlier than the dates of all other Qumran scrolls.¹⁸ By the same token, one of

12 C-14 analysis is based on the fact that the animal hides contained carbon-14 atoms when the animal was alive, and that the number of these atoms decreased at a measurable rate after its death, when they became carbon-12 atoms, all compared with the C-14 atoms in tree rings.

13 The best non-technical explanation of C-14 is probably by G. Doudna, "Dating the Scrolls on the Basis of Radiocarbon Analysis," in *DSS after Fifty Years*, 1:430–471. See also *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ed. M.O. Wise et al.; Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 441–453 ("Report and Discussion Concerning Radiocarbon Dating of Fourteen Dead Sea Scrolls").

14 For comparative tables recording the paleographical and C-14 data, see Webster, "Chronological Index" (362–368). 1QIsa^a was tested in the laboratories of Zurich and Tucson with similar results (see n. 15).

15 The report of the first C-14 tests (14 texts) carried out in Zurich is that of G. Bonani et al., "Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Atiqot* 20 (1991): 27–32 = *Radiocarbon* 34 (1992): 843–849. The second group of carbon-tests was carried out on 28 texts, of which one (1QIsa^a) had also been sampled by Bonani et al.: A.J.T. Jull et al., "Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert," *Radiocarbon* 37 (1995): 11–19 = *Atiqot* 28 (1996): 85–91. Some individual texts were examined as well: M. Broshi & H. Eshel, "Radiocarbon Dating and 'The Messiah Before Jesus,'" *RevQ* 20 (2001): 310–317 (4Q427 and 4Q491) = *Tarbiz* 70 (2001): 133–138; J.C. Charlesworth in his publications of XJoshua (MS Schøyen 2713) in *DJD* XXXVIII, 231–239 and XJudges (MS Schøyen 2861) in *DJD* XXVIII, 231–233.

16 Jull et al., "Radiocarbon Dating"; Bonani et al., "Radiocarbon Dating": 202–107 BCE.

17 Ibid.

18 Ibid. The fragment was probably contaminated, offsetting the precision of the C-14 analysis.

the fragments of 4QS^d (4Q258) dated to 134–230 CE at the one-sigma range, after the destruction of Qumran, is later than expected.¹⁹ Some scholars ascribe the deviating dates of these documents—too early according to the common view about Qumran—to the applying of castor oil to the skins in the 1950s in order to improve the clarity of the written text.²⁰ This claim is made especially by G. Doudna; Doudna's own view is that all the scrolls date from the period before 40 BCE.²¹ On the other hand, according to Broshi, the possible influence of such oil is negligible.²² The last word has not been said on this issue, and the presence of castor oil on the margins of the inscribed texts (from which samples were taken) as opposed to the inscribed surface itself, has yet to be proven. This discussion is important, since C-14 examinations are

-
- 19 Jull et al., "Radiocarbon Dating." Another fragment of the same scroll was dated to 11 BCE–78 CE.
- 20 See J. Strugnell, "On the History of the Photographing of the Discoveries in the Judean Desert for the International Group of Editors," in Tov—Pfann, *Companion Volume*, 125: "Next came some cleaning of the darker patches with oil, to bring out the writing—something chemically harmless, I am told, but some of us used it too generously in the early days."
- 21 "Dating the Scrolls on the Basis of Radiocarbon Analysis," 430–465; idem, *Redating the Dead Sea Scrolls Found at Qumran* (QC 8.4; Cracow: Enigma Press, 1999); idem, "The Legacy of an Error in Archaeological Interpretation: The Dating of the Qumran Cave Scroll Deposits," in Galor, Humbert, and Zangenberg, *Qumran, the Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 147–157. See also K.L. Rasmussen et al., "Cleaning and Radiocarbon Dating of Material from Khirbet Qumran," in Gunneweg, Greenblatt, and Adriaens, *Bio- and Material Cultures*, 139–163; idem et al., "The Effects of Possible Contamination on the Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls I: Castor Oil," *Radiocarbon* 43 (2001): 127–132 (note that the great majority of the samples taken are not from parchments); R. van der Water, "Reconsidering Palaeographic and Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *RevQ* 19 (1999–2000): 213–216; J. Atwill & S. Braunheim, "Redating the Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 11 (2004): 143–157; see also the reactions to this paper by J. van der Plicht, "Radiocarbon Dating and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Comment on 'Redating,'" *DSD* 14 (2007): 77–89; T. Higham, J.E. Taylor, & D. Green, "New Radiocarbon Determination," in Humbert and Gunneweg, *Khirbet Qumrán* (see n. 10 above), 197–200; J. van der Plicht & K.L. Rasmussen, "Radiocarbon Dating and Qumran," in *Holistic Qumran: Trans-disciplinary Research of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. Gunneweg, A. Adriaens, & J. Dik; STDJ 87; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 99–121.
- 22 Broshi, "The Dead Sea Scrolls," 135: "To 16 of the 34 samples no castor oil was applied; in the other, samples were taken from margins never touched by castor oil. Even if there were traces of oil they would have been eliminated by the pre-treatment." See also I. Carmi, "Are the 14C Dates of the Dead Sea Scrolls Affected by Castor Oil Contamination," *Radiocarbon* 44 (2002): 127–132.

very significant for scroll research. A. Mašić has developed a non-invasive technique to identify such oil.²³

1.1.2 Ink Research

So far ink has not been dated.

1.1.3 Skin Shrinkage

In a little-known study, Burton, Poole, and Reed suggested dating the scroll fragments according to the pattern of the shrinkage temperature of the collagen fibers in the skins (1959).²⁴ To the best of my knowledge, this method has not been applied to many Qumran fragments.

1.2 *Relation between Fragments*

When reconstructing scrolls there are many unknowns. The question of whether two or more fragments should be joined as adjacent fragments or designated as belonging to the same column or sheet, remains a major issue in scrolls research. Information about the content is usually insufficient in fragmentary scrolls. The analysis of script is often equally unsatisfying when analyzing small fragments. We would appreciate some help from the sciences in either linking fragments or excluding such a connection, but such help is still being developed. In short, we would like to have objective criteria for making a connection between any two fragments or excluding such a possibility. The first steps in exploring some possibilities have been made, but scholars are in need of a database incorporating alternative scientific data referring to a large number of fragments. The techniques that come to mind relating to the possible joining of fragments are DNA research, ink research, research of skin follicles and papyrus fibers, and elemental composition analysis. However, it should be remembered that these examinations can only determine whether or not two fragments belong to the same sheet. A fragment is not a unit. The real unit is the sheet, because the information gathered by the aforementioned examina-

23 "Dead Sea Scrolls: Non-invasive Characterisation of Conservation Treatment Materials by Means of IR-ERS," in *Israeli-Italian Bi-national Workshop*, Ramat-Gan, 2007 (unpublished); see also A. Mašić, I. Rabin, M. Ortolani, U. Schade, O. Hahn, T. Wolff, G. Weinberg, "Dead Sea Scrolls: Materials Characterisation by Means of IR-ERS, Synchrotron Based M-FTIR Spectroscopy, M-XRF and SEM," *8th European Conference on Research for Protection, Conservation and Enhancement of Cultural Heritage*, Ljubljana November 10–14, 2008. Conference Preprints (editors Jana Kolar and Matija Strlič), 134–135 (courtesy of I. Rabin).

24 D. Burton, J.B. Poole, & R. Reed, "A New Approach to the Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Nature* 184 (1959): 533–534.

tions pertains to the sheet as a whole. This examination is further complicated by the fact that skins of different animals were used as writing material for one scroll (see below). To the best of my knowledge, all these techniques would produce the same results for fragments taken from any part of the sheet (C-14, DNA, ink research²⁵), with the exception of the examination of fibers in papyrus, a technique that is not yet developed.

In all these cases, the sciences may help us in determining whether a frag. a and frag. b derive from the same sheet or of the same animal, no more and no less. If they derived from the same sheet, the exact relation between these fragments cannot be determined with the aid of the sciences. Since the fragments could be three columns apart, multiple possibilities should be envisaged. Furthermore, if two completely different compositions were written on skins deriving from the same animal, wrong conclusions could be drawn if we were to be guided solely by the scientific examinations.

1.2.1 DNA

DNA research of ancient texts is still in its infancy. Scholars have succeeded in extracting aDNA (ancient DNA) from ancient sources such as mummies, scrolls, and ancient animal bones. The main research in this area was carried out by Kahila Bar-Gal in her Hebrew University dissertation supervised by P. Smith, E. Tchernov, and S. Woodward.²⁶ The technique has been applied to fragments of several scrolls that have been mentioned by name: 4QS^b (4Q256), 4QS^d (4Q258), 4QS^e (4Q259), 4QIsa^a (4Q161), 11QT^a (fragments from six different sheets as well as stitching material)²⁷ together with a host of uninscribed

25 The results of ink research, as yet unexplored, would be less compelling, since two different scribes could have used the same ink in different compositions.

26 "Genetic Change in the *Capra* Species of Southern Levant over the Past 10,000 Years as Studied by DNA Analysis of Ancient and Modern Populations" (Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2000). See further Kahila Bar-Gal's study "What Can Fragments of the Dead Sea Scrolls Teach Us of Ancient Animal Husbandry?" (abstract of paper presented at the Symposium on the Role of Analytical Methods in the Study, Restoration, and Conservation of Ancient Manuscripts, with Emphasis on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Prague, 14 April 1999; online: <http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il/orion/programs/taskforce.shtml>); eadem et al., "The Genetic Signature of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature*, 27–31 January 1999 (ed. D. Goodblatt, A. Pinnick, and D.R. Schwartz; STDJ 37; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 165–171.

27 More precise data on the texts sampled are listed in Bar-Gal, "Genetic Change," 70.

fragments from caves 3 and 4. Examinations of 1QH^a and 4QP^{Hos}^b (4Q167) did not yield DNA.²⁸ The techniques used were described by Woodward.²⁹

This type of investigation can (1) determine the species of animal from which the skin derived, (2) distinguish between the DNA signature of individual animals, and (3) determine groups of animals (herds) from which the hides derived.³⁰ Ideally, these herds should be linked with bones of individual animals or herds, ancient or modern, since the DNA signature has not changed from antiquity to modern times. These links between hides and herds have hardly been made,³¹ and researchers are still waiting for the construction of databases that link specific fragments and bones.

1.2.2 Ink Research

The study of the composition of ink could give us some clues regarding the relationship between scroll fragments. So far, ink has not been dated but its composition has been analyzed, to a limited extent, by Nir-El and Broshi³² (pertaining to both inscribed papyri and skins) and a German research group (I. Rabin, O. Hahn et al.).³³ On the basis of examinations carried out in 1995 at the Soreq Nuclear Research Centre on fragments from caves 1 and 4, Nir-El and

28 As implied by the discussion of the results *ibid.*, 71–76.

29 Woodward et al., “Analysis of Parchment Fragments”; *idem* in D.W. Parry et al., “New Technological Advances: DNA, Databases, Imaging Radar,” in *DSS after Fifty Years*, 1:496–515; *idem*, “DNA Analysis of Ancient Parchment” (abstract of paper presented at the Symposium on the Role of Analytical Methods in the Study, Restoration, and Conservation of Ancient Manuscripts, with Emphasis on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Prague, 14 April 1999; online: <http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il/orion/programs/taskforce.shtml>).

30 See the summary by Woodward et al., “Analysis of Parchment Fragments,” 216: “The precision of the DNA analysis will allow us to identify at least three levels of hierarchy: the species, population, and individual animal from which the parchment was produced.”

31 Thus Bar-Gal, “Genetic Change,” 75, noting that the Qumran bones cannot be traced. The existence of such bones, including those of goats, is mentioned in Y. Magen and Y. Peleg, “The Qumran Excavations 1993–2004, Preliminary Report,” *Judea and Samaria Publications* 6 (2007): 1–74 (42–43).

32 Y. Nir-El & M. Broshi, “The Black Ink of the Qumran Scrolls,” *DSD* 3 (1996): 157–167. For earlier studies, see among others S.H. Steckoll, “Investigations of the Inks Used in Writing the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Nature* 220 (1968): 91–92. Other examinations are mentioned by Nir-El and Broshi. See also the discussion in Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 53–55.

33 See the summary by I. Rabin et al., “Characterization of the Writing Media of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Holistic Qumran* (see n. 21 above), 123–134. The techniques used are micro x-ray fluorescence, FT-IR spectroscopy, mass spectrometry, and scanning electron microscopy. See also O. Hahn et al., “Non-destructive Investigation of the Scroll Material: 4QComposition Concerning Divine Providence (4Q413),” *DSD* 15 (2007): 359–364 (described below).

Broshi concluded that no metal ink was used in writing the Qumran scrolls under investigation.³⁴ The examinations were made with the EDXRF (Energy Dispersive x-Ray Fluorescence) procedure. These scholars assumed that the copper elements in the ink derived from copper inkwells used by scribes, and that the ink used was carbon-based.³⁵ A similar suggestion had been made earlier by H.J. Plenderleith,³⁶ Steckoll (see n. 32), and Haran,³⁷ mainly for the texts from cave 1.

In the future, study of the components of ink may help us to pinpoint different types of ink. Rabin et al. suggest that a basic distinction can be made between ink prepared at Qumran and ink prepared elsewhere because of an analysis of the water component in ink.³⁸ In particular, these scholars point out that the chlorium/bromium ratio is lower in places near the Dead Sea than in other localities, and that this kind of study enabled them to determine the place of origin of 1QH^a in the Qumran area. Studies like this could help us differentiate between groups of scrolls penned at different locations, even if the locations themselves cannot be named. Other areas of investigation are the ink of corrections in the text as opposed to that of the main text as well as possible distinctions between the scrolls found in the different caves.

1.2.3 Elemental Composition Analysis

A study by Hahn et al. based on the contaminants present in the skin and ink showed how two fragments cannot have belonged to the same sheet.³⁹ According to these scholars, "Scroll and ink are organic materials, consisting mainly of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen and nitrogen. In addition to these main elements a variety of contaminants are found. Their kind, type and quantity depend on the details of the preparation process and storage conditions. For example,

34 The sources sampled are listed in Nir-El and Broshi, "Black Ink," 157, n. 1. See further Y. Nir-El, "מקורו של הצבען בדיו שחורה בכתבת ספרים, תפילין ומזוזות," *Sinai* 57 (1993–1994): 261–268.

35 On the other hand, according to the editors of 4QpaleoExod^m, the ink used in that manuscript contained iron: P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J.E. Sanderson in *DJD* IX, 18.

36 "Technical Note on Unwrapping of Dead Sea Scroll Fragments," in *DJD* I, 39.

37 M. Haran, "Scribal Workmanship in Biblical Times: The Scrolls and Writing Implements," *Tarbiz* 50 (1980–1981): 65–87 (81–84) (Heb. with Eng. summary). According to Haran, metal-based ink was used only from the second century CE onwards.

38 I. Rabin et al., "On the Origin of the Ink of the Thanksgiving Scroll (1QHodayot^a)," *DSD* 16 (2009), 97–106.

39 O. Hahn et al., "Non-destructive Investigation of the Scroll Material: 4QComposition Concerning Divine Providence (4Q413)," *DSD* 15 (2007): 359–364.

minerals dissolved in the water used for the preparation of the scroll material and inks are a source of a specific contamination that would normally be distributed evenly throughout the material. On the other hand, the contaminants deposited on a scroll surface, due to its storage, (e.g., on the floor of a cave), would be mainly restricted to the surface areas and more likely to appear as patches.” This examination makes use of a micro X-ray fluorescence spectrometer (XRF) as well as a micro-focus confocal XRF. The authors use this approach in an examination of two small fragments published as 4Q413 that belong to the top of the same column of a sheet.⁴⁰ They were separated and renamed 4Q413 and 4Q413a by T. Elgvin on the basis of paleography and microscopic skin analysis.⁴¹ Elgvin’s microscopic analysis showed that the surface of 4Q413a “is more scraped than that of 4Q413, so that the hair structure is not visible, while it is clearly seen on 4Q413.” The elemental composition analysis of the skin and ink executed by Hahn et al. now confirmed these findings, demonstrating that the two fragments could not have belonged to the same sheet.⁴² This type of analysis may well be better suited for negative than positive conclusions, but the authors do not say this in their paper. In any event, a similar approach followed by Rabin et al. in the study mentioned in n. 38 provides much promise for positive results. These authors study the composition analysis of the surface and inner layers of the skins, and we wait for more specific results.

Scribes probably prepared their own ink. It is not known whether ink prepared from the same components deposited in different inkwells would produce a different type of chemical signature. On the whole, the identification of scribes or compositions on the basis of the ink used has not even begun.

1.2.4 Stitching Material

Sheets in inscribed skin scrolls were joined with different stitching materials. DNA and C-14 analysis of the stitching materials may aid us in understanding the background of the different scrolls. So far, one such examination has been carried out (see n. 46).

According to rabbinic prescriptions, scroll sheets are to be joined with sinews from the same ritually clean cattle or wild animals from which the scroll itself was prepared.⁴³ The evidence suggests that most of the stitching material

40 E. Qimron in *DJD* XX, 169–171.

41 T. Elgvin, “4Q413: A Hymn and a Wisdom Instruction,” in Paul, *Emanuel*, 205–214.

42 Hahn et al., “Non-destructive Investigation.”

43 See *b. Menah.* 31b “only with sinews, but not with thread”; *y. Meg.* 1.71d “It is also an oral prescription delivered to Moses at Sinai that <scrolls> shall be written on the skins of

used in the scrolls from Qumran indeed consists of sinews. Further investigation should help us to determine which threads were made of animal sinews and which, contrary to rabbinic ruling, were of flax. In their 1962 research, Poole and Reed claimed that the stitching material examined was of vegetable origin and most probably flax.⁴⁴ It is not known, however, which specific scrolls were examined for this purpose. At the same time, more recent examinations have been applied to four specific scrolls.⁴⁵ Further research is needed regarding the consistency of the use of the stitching material in the same scroll. The animal stitching material may also be used for DNA examinations.⁴⁶

1.3 *Retrieving Previously Illegible Letters with the Aid of Advanced Photographic Techniques*⁴⁷

For their time, the black/white infrared photographs taken by Najib Anton Albina, the photographer at the Palestine Archeological Museum (PAM) in the 1950s and 1960s, were extraordinarily good.⁴⁸ Other early photographs were

ritually clean cattle or ritually clean wild animals, and be sewn together with their sinews." This was indeed the case with the stitch material and the sheets of 11QT^a (domestic goat), see n. 45 below.

44 Poole and Reed, "The Preparation of Leather," 22.

45 The following conclusions have been reached:

1QIsa^a: M. Burrows with the assistance of J.C. Trever & W.H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, vol. 1: *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary* (New Haven: ASOR, 1950), xiv: linen thread.

4QNum^b: N. Jastram in *DJD* XII, 217: flax.

4QCryptA Words of the Maskil (4Q298): S.J. Pfann in *DJD* XX, 2: flax.

4QApocryphal Pentateuch A (4Q368): J.C. VanderKam and M. Brady in *DJD* XXVIII, 131: flax.

46 In the meantime, see A. Gorski, "Analysis of Microscopic Material and the Stitching of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Study" (abstract of paper presented at the Symposium on the Role of Analytical Methods in the Study, Restoration, and Conservation of Ancient Manuscripts, with Emphasis on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Prague, 14 April 1999; online: <http://orion.mssc.huji.ac.il/orion/programs/taskforce.shtml>). This paper refers to the stitching of 1QpHab and 1QIsa^a (no conclusions). See also by the same author "Analysis of Microscopic Material and the Stitching of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Study," in *Historical Perspectives*, 173–178. Bar-Gal, "Genetic Change," 72 and Table 3.6 mentions the sampling of stitch material of the 11QT^a (domestic goat).

47 For good summaries of all aspects relating to the imaging of the scrolls, see G. Bearman, S.J. Pfann, and S.A.I. Spiro, "Imaging the Scrolls: Photographic and Direct Digital Acquisition," in *DSS after Fifty Years*, 1:472–495; B. and K. Zuckerman, "Photography and Computer Imaging," *Encyclopedia DSS*, 2:669–675.

48 See F.M. Cross, "On the History of the Photography," and J. Strugnell, "On the History of

equally good: the infrared black/white photographs by the Biberkrauts of the scrolls purchased by the State of Israel, and those of 1QIsa^a, 1QS, and 1QpHab by John Trever.⁴⁹ The three series of PAM photographs, more than the fragments themselves, formed the basis for the study and publication of the scrolls in *DJD*. Often, the photographs reveal more details than the fragments themselves, although the fragments need always to be consulted because only they reveal the distinctions between ink and shadow.

In later years, with the advancement of technology, better photographs were taken, revealing additional parts of letters, complete letters, and in rare cases complete words.⁵⁰ The following innovative techniques were used.

1. Use of filters in infrared photography (B. and K. Zuckerman).
2. High density digitization. This technique was applied to the *Genesis Apocryphon* in 1993 by Bearman and the Zuckermans using a “new tunable filter that could be set to any wavelength in the IR <the infrared spectrum> with a very narrow bandpass.”⁵¹ A second imaging expedition was launched by these scholars in 1997, producing new digital infrared images of approximately 900 fragments (not scrolls).⁵² Some of these photographs revealed additional letters in darkened areas.⁵³ Additional letters were revealed on the inscribed skins in separate projects by Bearman⁵⁴ and

the Photographing of the Discoveries in the Judean Desert for the International Group of Editors,” in Tov—Pfann, *Companion Volume*, 121–122 and 123–134.

49 Additional early photographs by David Shinhav, Ruth Yekutieli, Tsila Sagiv, and Robert Schlosser are described by J.C. VanderKam and P.W. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002), 69–70.

50 The collection as a whole has not been re-photographed although in 2008 plans were underway for such an enterprise.

51 Bearman, Pfann, and Spiro, “Imaging,” 488.

52 Ibid.

53 See the photograph of 4QCant^b by G. Bearman and S.A.I. Spiro on behalf of the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center as presented by E. Tov in *DJD* xvi, 209 and pl. xxv.

54 G.H. Bearman and S.I. Spiro, “Imaging: Clarifying the Issues,” *DSD* 3 (1996): 321–328; iidem, “Archaeological Applications of Advanced Imaging Techniques. Reading Ancient Documents,” *BA* 59 (1996): 56–66; iidem, “Imaging Clarified,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 5–12; D.M. Cabries, S.W. Booras, & G.H. Bearman, “Imaging the Past: Recent Applications of Multispectral Imaging Technology to Deciphering Manuscripts,” *Antiquity: A Quarterly Review of Archaeology* 77 (2003): 359–372.

- Zuckerman.⁵⁵ Likewise, Johnston also revealed additional letters, especially in 11QT^a.⁵⁶ Puech was able to improve the reading of the *Copper Scroll* with the aid of radiographs and photographs of the flattened replica of the scroll.⁵⁷
3. Lange's method of Computer Aided Text-Reconstruction and Transcription (CATT)⁵⁸ offers a new software option for the reconstruction of fragments based on digitized images of scrolls.⁵⁹ The author suggests that each scholar digitizes his or her own images of the scrolls, and he guides the reader in the use of software programs that can be used in order to improve the readability of these images.⁶⁰ The author also shows how to scan individual letters and combine them into units that can be electronically placed in *lacunae*, thus examining the correctness of reconstructions.

-
- 55 B. Zuckerman in collaboration with S.A. Reed, "A Fragment of an Unstudied Column of 11QTgJob," *The Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon Newsletter* 10 (1993): 1–7 (online: <http://cali.cn.huc.edu/newsletter/Zuckreed.html>); M.J. Lundberg and B. Zuckerman, "When Images Meet: The Potential of Photographic and Computer Imaging Technology for the Study of the Copper Scroll," in *Copper Scroll Studies* (ed. G.E. Brooke & P.R. Davies; JSPSup 40; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 45–55; B. Zuckerman, "Bringing the Dead Sea Scrolls Back to Life: A New Evaluation of Photographic and Electronic Imaging of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 3 (1996): 178–207. Lists of new readings revealed by Zuckerman's techniques are included in "The Targums of Job (4QTgJob and 11QTgJob)" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translation* (ed. J.C. Charlesworth; The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming).
- 56 J.H. Charlesworth, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Scientific Methodologies," *Optics and Imaging in the Information Age* (IS&T: The Society for Imaging Science and Technology, 1997), 266–274; K. Knox, R. Johnston, & R.L. Easton, "Imaging the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Optics and Photonics News* 8 (1997): 30.
- 57 É. Puech, "Some Results of the Restoration of the Copper Scroll by EDF Mécénat," in Schiffman, *DSS*, 889–894; D. Brizemeure, N. Lacoudre, & É. Puech, *Le Rouleau de cuivre de la grotte 3 de Qumrân: Expertise, Restauration, Epigraphie* (2 vols.; STDJ 55; Leiden: Brill, 2006).
- 58 A. Lange, *Computer-Aided Text-Reconstruction and Transcription: CATT Manual* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993). For a review, see G. Bearman in *DSD* 1 (1994): 373–375.
- 59 Lange describes his own technique as follows (p. 3): "... uses image editing software in dealing with the several different types of damage done to manuscripts and inscriptions. Image editing programs try to transfer the photographic darkroom into the desktop computer."
- 60 When this book was written, digitized images were not yet available in commercial databases such as *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library* (rev. ed.; Brigham Young University, 2006), part of the *Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library* of Brill Publishers (ed. E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2006).

1.4 *Identifying Fragments and Determining the Relation between Fragments*

1.4.1 Computer-Assisted Identifications

To the best of my knowledge, little use has been made of computer-assisted research in the identification of small fragments. Parry identified a number of minute fragments of 4QSam^a with the help of the WordCruncher program.⁶¹ Pike and Skinner recognized many of the hitherto unidentified fragments with the aid of the same program.⁶² Tigchelaar identified many fragments with the aid of the *Accordance* program.⁶³ Undoubtedly, the use of *Accordance* or *Word-Cruncher* could produce many additional identifications. Optical Character Recognition (OCR) could have been employed for the analysis of script or the identification of partially preserved letters, but to the best of my knowledge, this technique has not been used.⁶⁴

1.4.2 Research of Hair Follicles in Skins and Fibers in Papyri

The analysis of hair follicles and papyrus fibers could indicate that two or more scroll fragments derived from either the same or a different sheet. Barns provided the first description of the procedure followed for papyrus fragments,⁶⁵ described in greater detail by Pfann.⁶⁶ Pfann likewise briefly described the procedure followed for the study of hair follicles in skins.⁶⁷ In both cases, much more detailed research is needed.

61 See F.M. Cross, D.W. Parry, and R.J. Saley in *DJD* XVII, 3.

62 *DJD* XXXIII.

63 E.J.C. Tigchelaar, "4Q499 48+47 (par 4Q369 1 ii): A Forgotten Identification," *RevQ* 18 (1997): 303–306; idem, "Minuscule Qumranica I," *RevQ* 21 (2004): 643–648; idem, "On the Unidentified Fragments of *DJD* XXXIII and PAM 43.680: A New Manuscript of 4QNarrative and Poetic Composition, and Fragments of 4Q13, 4Q269, 4Q525 and 4QSb (?)," *RevQ* 21 (2004): 477–485; idem, "A Cave 4 Fragment of *Divre Mosheh* (4QDM) and the Text of 1Q22 1:7–10 and Jubilees 1:9, 14," *DSD* 12 (2005): 303–312.

64 One could teach the computer the various shapes of the letters of each scroll, so that the program would suggest readings for partially preserved letters.

65 J.W.B. Barns, "Note on Papyrus Fibre Pattern," in *DJD* VI, 29.

66 S.J. Pfann in *DJD* XXXVI, 517–523.

67 S.J. Pfann, "Hair Follicle Analysis of Primitive Parchments: An Essential Tool for the Reconstruction of Fragmentary Dead Sea Scrolls" (abstract of paper presented at the Symposium on the Role of Analytical Methods in the Study, Restoration, and Conservation of Ancient Manuscripts, with Emphasis on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Prague, 14 April 1999; online: <http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il/orion/programs/taskforce.shtml>): "The pattern, form, size and density of hair follicles which occur over the hides of various animals do so with a fair degree of consistency. Those hides which preserve their epidermis and are used in the

The research of skin and papyrus sheets is promising, but at this stage it is unclear whether the various parameters identified in the fragments are distinctive enough in order to identify and differentiate between individual sheets. Research needs to proceed from the features of known sheets of complete scrolls to fragmentary texts, and such studies have not yet been written.

In the case of papyrus fragments, examining each papyrus strip involves the color, thickness, density, variability, and angle of the intersection between the horizontal and vertical strips of papyrus.

Research carried out so far by Pfann, focusing on fragmentary texts, shows the possibilities this research has in store. Pfann analyzed the papyrus texts in the cryptic script 4Qpap cryptA Midrash Sefer Moshe (4Q249)⁶⁸ and 4Q249a–z and 4Q250a–j,⁶⁹ focusing on the special features of each papyrus fragment. In the case of skin fragments, Pfann likewise analyzed the special hair follicle features of each individual fragment of 4QCryptA Words of the Maskil to All Sons of Dawn (4Q298).⁷⁰ This analysis enabled him to support the reconstruction of fragments belonging to the same sheet. The hair structure of 4Q413 and 4Q413a was found to be different by Elgvin (see n. 41 above).

Each single feature of the papyrus or skin, and definitely the combined features may give guidance regarding the placement of fragments in a particular sheet. However, this type of research is rather limited. Pfann examined the fragments that had been identified at an earlier stage as belonging to specific scrolls. Within those parameters, he separated the papyrus fragments into many different compositions based on the criteria mentioned above. This research enabled him to surmise that specific fragments belonged to the same sheet of papyrus, but no more than that. In the case of skins, the fragments could be placed anywhere in the sheet, either in the same column or one or two columns apart. In the case of papyrus, the guidance of the horizontal and vertical strips may aid in a more specific location alongside the horizontal or

preparation of scrolls maintain these hair follicle patterns. These same follicle patterns preserved on the surfaces of disjointed fragments of the Dead Sea Scrolls has proven to contain important clues aiding in their reconstruction (and thus their meaning and interpretation). This form of analysis was developed by the author while working with the edition of the various Dead Sea Scrolls assigned to him for publication over the past decade. With the aid of the binocular microscope many proposed links between disjointed fragments have been either confirmed or disproved based on this work.”

68 S.J. Pfann in *DJD* XXXV, 1–24.

69 S.J. Pfann in *DJD* XXXVI (2000), 515–701.

70 S.J. Pfann & M. Kister, “4Q298: The Maskil’s Address to All Sons of Dawn,” *JQR* 85 (1994): 203–235; iidem, *DJD* XX, 1–30.

vertical strips, but further research on the known complete papyri has to consolidate the criteria used. Probably the strongest merit of this and any similar procedure is the ability to disprove that two fragments belonged to the same skin or papyrus sheet.

1.4.3 The Stegemann System of Reconstructing

The so-called “Stegemann system of reconstructing fragmentary scrolls”⁷¹ belongs here only partially since it is based not on the sciences but on logical inference of destruction patterns of the skin or papyrus. Among other things, on the basis of the supposed measurements of the scroll and the increase in size between revolutions of the scroll starting with its innermost end, this system tries to establish the distance between the fragments (columns) based on identical destruction patterns, if any, repeated in each revolution of the scroll.

2 Some Technical Data about the Scrolls

When integrating data from the sciences into the reconstruction of the scrolls, we have to take into consideration the data known about them. Otherwise, we are in danger of applying the wrong types of conclusions. The following parameters relate to this reconstruction.⁷²

1. The first stage in the preparation of skins was the slaughtering of an animal and the preparation of its hide for the production of the scroll material. Even the leftovers were used for writing; contrary to practice

⁷¹ H. Stegemann, “Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L.H. Schiffman; JSPSup 8; JSOT/ASOR Monograph Series 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 189–220; A. Steudel, “Assembling and Reconstructing Manuscripts,” in *DSS after Fifty Years*, 1:516–534; E. Chazon, “The Qumran Community, The Dead Sea Scrolls and The Physical Method of Scrolls’ Reconstruction” (abstract of paper presented at the Symposium on the Role of Analytical Methods in the Study, Restoration, and Conservation of Ancient Manuscripts, with Emphasis on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Prague, 14 April 1999; online: <http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il/orion/programs/taskforce.shtml>). See also D. Stoll, “Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer: mathematisch oder Wie kann man einer Rekonstruktion Gestalt verleihen?” in *Qumranstudien: Vorträge und Beiträge der Teilnehmer des Qumranseminars auf dem internationalen Treffen der Society of Biblical Literature, Münster, 25.–26. Juli 1993* (ed. H.-J. Fabry, A. Lange, & H. Lichtenberger; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 205–217.

⁷² For a detailed description of each issue, see my *Scribal Practices*.

in later centuries, most of the *tefillin* found at Qumran were written on irregularly shaped pieces that were leftovers from the preparation of large skins. Upon preparation, most skins were inscribed on the (hairy) outside layer, while 11QT^a was inscribed on the inside of the skin (the flesh side).⁷³

2. The *length* of the composition was calculated approximately before commencing the writing, so that the required number of sheets could be ordered from a manufacturer or could be prepared to fit the size of the composition. Subsequently, the individual sheets were ruled and inscribed and only afterwards stitched together. The fact that some ruled sheets were used as uninscribed handle sheets (e.g. the last sheets of 11QT^a and 11QShirShabb) and that some uninscribed top margins were ruled (the second sheet of 1QPHab) shows that the ruling was sometimes executed without relation to the writing of a specific scroll. The numbering of a few sheets preserved in the Judean Desert probably indicates that some or most sheets were inscribed separately, and joined subsequently according to the sequence of these numbers (however, the great majority of the sheets were not numbered).
3. The first step in the preparation of scrolls for writing was the *ruling* (scoring), which facilitated the execution of the inscription in straight lines. The scroll was written by hanging the letters from the lines. This ruling provided graphical guidance for the writing, horizontal ruling for the lines, and vertical ruling for the beginning and/or end of the columns. In very few cases, the ruling was indicated by diluted ink.
4. Almost all Qumran and Masada texts written on skins in the square script had ruled horizontal lines in accordance with the practice for most literary texts written on skins in Semitic languages and in Greek. On the other hand, texts written on papyrus were not ruled. The horizontal and vertical fibers of the papyrus probably provided some form of guidance for the writing.
5. The ruling was sometimes applied with the aid of guide dots/strokes, or with a grid-like device, while in other instances no device was used. These guide dots ("points jalons"), or sometimes strokes, were drawn in order to guide the drawing of dry lines. The ruling might have been executed by the scribes, but it is more likely that it was applied by the scroll manufacturers without reference to the text to be inscribed, as indicated by several

73 For parallels in rabbinic literature, see *y. Meg.* 1.71d: "One writes on the hairy side of the skin" (cf. *Massekhet Sefer Torah* 1.4).

discrepancies between the inscribed text and the ruled lines, such as a larger number of ruled lines than inscribed text (see 4QDeutⁿ).

6. The preparation of the material for writing included not just the ruling, but also the preparation of the surface for writing in columns. The number of columns per sheet and their sizes differed from scroll to scroll, sometimes from sheet to sheet, and they depended much on the size of the sheets and the scroll.
7. The size of the scroll depended on the dimensions of the sheets. At Qumran, the length of most skin sheets varied between 21 and 90 cm, usually 30–40 cm.⁷⁴ The natural limitations of the sizes of animal hides determined the different lengths of these sheets, which varied more in some scrolls than in others.
8. The sizes of the hides derived from the different animals differ, but the animals that have been identified (calf, sheep, ibex, goat) would not yield more than one hide of 90 × 60 cm or two or three short ones. In some cases, more than one composition could be written on the material provided by a single animal, while in other cases several animals would be needed for a long composition, such as 11QT^a and the large Isaiah scroll.
9. There is a positive correlation between the length and width of columns: as a rule the higher the column, the wider the lines, and the longer the scroll.
10. The sizes of the columns differ in accordance with the number of columns per sheet, the scope of the sheets, and the conventions developed by the scroll manufacturers. The different parameters of the columns pertain to their width and length as well as to the top, bottom, and intercolumnar margins. In some Qumran scrolls, the height and width of the columns are fairly consistent, while in most scrolls these parameters varied from sheet to sheet as well as within each sheet, in accordance with the measurements of the sheets. The average number of lines per column in Qumran scrolls is probably 20, with a height of approximately 14–15 cm (including the top and bottom margins). Larger scrolls contained columns with between 25 and as many as 60 lines. Scrolls of the smallest dimensions contained merely 5–13 lines and their height was similarly small. Among the scrolls with a large writing block, one finds many texts from Qumran, as well as *all* the scrolls from Masada, Naḥal Ḥever, Sdeir, and Murabbaʿat

74 For example, 1QIsa^a consists of seventeen sheets (ten sheets measuring 35–47.7 cm, five 48.7–62.8 cm, and two 25.2–26.9 cm). 11QT^a is composed of nineteen sheets (eight measuring 37–43 cm, ten 47–61 cm, and the final sheet measuring 20 cm). For additional details, see Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 79–81.

that can be measured. The same compositions were often written on scrolls of differing sizes, although in some cases a degree of regularity is visible.

11. All biblical texts were inscribed on one side only, while several nonbiblical texts were inscribed on both sides (opisthographs).
12. With one possible exception, all compositions were written on separate scrolls. Some biblical scrolls contain more than one book (the Torah, Minor Prophets).
13. Some, mainly long, manuscripts were written by more than one scribe.

3 **Aid from the Sciences for the Reconstruction of Ancient Scrolls: Possibilities and Impossibilities**

In previous examinations, the reconstruction of the missing parts of the ancient scrolls was based mainly on content. In the case of biblical scrolls or other known compositions, content is our main guide, but even in these compositions small fragments with partial or frequently occurring words cannot be identified easily. In other cases, with fragmentary contents and the fertile minds of scholars, there are many possibilities and therefore it would be good to be aided by additional methods. Such aid may come from an exact or almost exact physical join, but such joins are rare. Some fragments of similar shape reflect subsequent layers or revolutions of a scroll (see n. 71), but such cases are also rare. In many cases, we would like to look to the sciences for help. Our main interest would be in proving or disproving a link already made between two fragments or in searching for a scroll to which a given fragment may have belonged. In such cases, we would like to resort to the sciences for objective criteria. The sciences have been invoked often, with high expectations, so it is time to be a little realistic.

It would not be feasible to send all the fragments to C-14 analysis only in order to know if their C-14 dates match. Ink analysis, if advanced sufficiently, would be easier and may be very relevant. In my view, the so-called elemental composition analysis sounds promising, and it is non-destructive, but we wait for the verdict of scientists. DNA will provide some answers, as will the follicle research on skins, and fiber research on papyri. It should be remembered that the maximum results we would receive refer to the identity of the complete sheet(s) from which the fragments derived, and not to the placing of individual fragments. These sheets were 21 to 90 cm long at Qumran, mostly 30–40 cm, and the placing of a fragment in such a large space would leave many options open. Most animals would not yield more than one hide of 90 × 60 cm.

On the other hand, in the descriptions of the DNA method, especially that of Woodward,⁷⁵ the expectations for DNA analysis have been very high. This scholar, who together with Kahila Bar-Gal was able to derive aDNA from ancient objects, was not sufficiently aware of the limitations of DNA in the case of the scrolls. In a programmatic paper published in 1998, he lists five questions for which DNA was supposed to provide answers.

1. "How many different manuscripts are represented in the collection of fragments at the Rockefeller and Israel Museums? ... Obtaining DNA signatures unique to each manuscript will make it possible to sort out the physical relationships of scroll fragments." At most, however, we would be able to list the individual animals, from whose skins the hides were derived. When naming these animals "animal 1," "animal 2," etc., we would have an important summary list, but that list would provide only a few clues for researchers. Thus, if two different compositions were written on the hide of animal 1, DNA alone would not suffice to distinguish between them. Further, multi-sheet compositions required more than one animal, sometimes ten or more, so that DNA signatures alone would not be able to distinguish between Qumran manuscripts.
2. "Which pieces can be grouped together as originating from the same scroll because they are from identical or related manuscripts? ... This should assist both in the reconstruction of manuscripts and in the verification of assemblies that were previously already made." It seems to me that all these are idle hopes as explained in my reply to item 1.
3. "Did more than one scribe work on a single document, or did different scribes use parchment that originated from the same source for different manuscripts?" In my view, neither question can be answered with DNA.
4. "Is the parchment for the patch from the same herd as the original manuscript? Does the patch represent a herd from a different region, reflecting mobility of either the original scroll or the herd?" These suggestions are helpful,⁷⁶ but impractical. Most importantly, the number of patches in the scrolls can be counted on one hand.
5. "Does the collection represent a library from a single locality, or is it a collection representing contributions from a wide region?" In general it is

⁷⁵ Woodward, "New Technological Advances."

⁷⁶ The patch in 4Q22 and its main text were dated to different periods with C-14 analysis, see Jull et al., "Radiocarbon Dating," 86.

true that DNA analysis will help us to know more about the provenance of the hides, if only the connections between hides and bones can be made.

The expectations expressed in the Introduction to the Qumran scrolls by VanderKam and Flint, which run parallel to those of Woodward, are equally as utopian.⁷⁷

4 Conclusions

Summarizing the various types of expectations for scroll research, we note that they may help us with regard to some issues.

- a. C-14 examinations should be continued as a useful tool for dating in spite of the uncertainty regarding the contamination of castor oil.
- b. If performed on a large scale, C-14 examinations could also help us understand the relationship between many individual fragments. For example, two or more fragments assigned to the same column or sheet should not have different C-14 dates.
- c. Ink research, research of skin follicles and papyrus fibers, and elemental composition analysis such as the chlorium/bromium ratio should be encouraged as non-destructive examinations that may help us understand the relation between individual fragments. The merits of these examinations should be reviewed by scientists, since we humanists lack the means to review the methods used.
- d. The infrared color photographing of all the fragments with new techniques should be encouraged.

At the same time, expectations from these techniques should be realistic, taking into consideration the realia of scroll production such as described above, in particular the fact that the sheet and not the fragment is the unit of reference.

In an ideal world, we would have access to a database providing information of all the types described above about all the scroll fragments. Undoubtedly,

77 VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 55–84 (57–58). 1. “Assembling scrolls in the Rockefeller and Israel Museums.” 2. “Making new reconstructions and assembling earlier ones.” 3. “Parchment used for patches.” 4. “Scrolls made from more than one animal.” 5. “The species of animals used for production.” 6. “Assessing the scope of the collection.”

this information would help us to solve some questions that face researchers. For example, by examining the technical data about the scrolls, we may be able to create clusters⁷⁸ of scrolls of a certain nature, such as Qumran scrolls as opposed to non-Qumran scrolls (based on elemental composition analysis). We may be able to find that scrolls written on a specific type of skin (DNA analysis) or with a specific type of ink have something in common, or that the Hebrew scrolls somehow differ from those written in Aramaic.

In the analysis of individual fragments, this database would help especially in negative aspects, namely the suggestion that two fragments that were joined in the past should not be ascribed to the same manuscript, as in the case of 4Q413 and 4Q413a discussed above.

In an ideal world we should have access to a database like this.

78 The idea was expressed already by G. Kahila Bar-Gal, "Genetic Change," 76: "These findings show the ability of the aDNA method to contribute in matching and grouping together scroll fragments. These results also stress the possibility to solve the problem of the 10,000 unmatched fragments using genetic analysis."

Some Thoughts at the Close of the *Discoveries in the Judaeen Desert* Publication Project

Now that the Dead Sea Scrolls have been published and we think we know everything about them, it is time to contemplate on the things we do *not* know regarding the published fragments.

1 Reconstruction of the Segments That Have been Lost

Scholars are used to working with the preserved fragments, but they also attempt to reconstruct the missing material. In multiple copies of the same composition, such as the Community Rule, the Damascus Document, and all the biblical scrolls, the overlapping texts are of great help for such reconstructions.

There are no objective criteria for such reconstructions. For example, Qimron and Puech reconstructed 4Q522 in a completely different way from one another. The left column of the largest fragment, frg. 9 ii, was published preliminarily by Puech in 1992 and described by him as dealing with “David and his son as well as the temple and tabernacle.”¹ This topic was, according to Puech, the reason for the inclusion of the “Jerusalem Psalm,” Psalm 122, in that composition. The 1992 study by Puech also contains a long exposition on the Rock of Zion and the place of the altar. Reacting to this publication, Qimron republished frg. 9 ii with several new readings and reconstructions, based on the photograph published by Puech.² Qimron proposed a completely different interpretation of this column, describing it as a fragment of what he named the “Joshua Cycles.”³ In the final publication of this text in *DJD*, Puech reflects this

1 É. Puech, “La pierre de Sion et l’autel des holocaustes d’après un manuscrit hébreu de la grotte 4 (4Q522),” *RB* 99 (1992): 676–696.

2 E. Qimron, “Concerning ‘Joshua Cycles’ from Qumran,” *Tarbiz* 63 (1995): 503–508 (Heb. with Eng. Sum.).

3 In this interpretation, Qimron was actually preceded by R.H. Eisenman & M. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Shaftesbury, Dorset: Element, 1992), 89–93, who were probably the first to recognize the true meaning of this document.

understanding when naming the text “Prophétie de Josué (4QApocrJosué?).”⁴ A comparison of the publications by Puech and Qimron is a veritable exercise in the method of comparing the exegesis of Qumran fragments in which scholars necessarily read much into the lacunae.

A *cause célèbre* in this regard is 4Q341 that came into this world as 4QTherapeia in Allegro’s analysis in 1979.⁵ At that point, the text was taken as a transliteration in Hebrew of a Greek medical document containing such words as *Magnus* (l. 4) and *Horqanus* (l. 7). According to Allegro, its “language is an extraordinary mixture of transliterated Greek, Aramaic, and a grammatically irregular Hebrew, giving the inescapable impression of deliberate obscurantism, not entirely unfamiliar in medical writing.”⁶ This idea was taken up by J.H. Charlesworth who essentially accepted Allegro’s transcription.⁷ This interpretation gave rise to new theories concerning the nature of the Qumran community. However, not much later the real nature of this document was discovered by Naveh who demonstrated that this is a Hebrew writing exercise by a fairly skilled person, perhaps a scribe. This scribe used a small left-over piece of leather in order to write some meaningless words and letters while accustoming his hand to the pen and ink and to the writing material before beginning to write in earnest.⁸

In these two cases, the reconstruction pertained to the understanding of the scroll as a whole. On a smaller scale, should we indulge in reconstructing the missing material in 4QSam^a and, if so, in which way? The lacunae in this scroll should clearly not be reconstructed on the basis of MT since the preserved parts of that scroll do not reflect MT. Should they be reconstructed on the basis of the LXX since the Samuel scroll is often very close to the LXX? This was the practice of the *DJD* editors of that volume,⁹ and that procedure is probably correct in several cases, but not all reconstructions in the lacunae in the scroll should be based on retroversion from Greek into Hebrew.

Obviously, the understanding of important details often depends on the reading of single letters, which equally often are contested. Thus, as one of the

4 *DJD* XXV.

5 J.M. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Myth* (London: Prometheus, 1979), 235–240, pls. 16–17.

6 The quote is from p. 235.

7 J.H. Charlesworth, *The Discovery of a Dead Sea Scroll (4Q Therapeia): Its Importance in the History of Medicine and Jesus Research* (Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University, 1985).

8 J. Naveh, “A Medical Document or a Writing Exercise? The So-called 4QTherapeia,” *IEJ* 36 (1986): 52–55, pl. 11. This understanding was later accepted in Naveh’s edition in *DJD* XXXVI.

9 *DJD* XVII.

proofs for the gradual development of the tripartite canon in the second century BCE, one always quotes 4QMMT C lines 10–11, “[... And] we have [written] to you so that you may study (carefully) the book of Moses and the books of the Prophets and (the writings of) David” [וְהַנְּבִיאִים וְדָוִד] [כתב]נו אליהם שתבין בספר משה [ו]בספר דָּוִד.¹⁰

The reading of the key words, based on the combination of three separate fragments on pl. VI, is very tentative. However, in a 2003 study Ulrich suggested that these words should be read differently.¹¹ According to him, the juxtaposition of the three fragments 18, 17, and 15 is far from certain, and the reading of the remnants of the preserved letters is likewise questionable. He shows that possibly Moses is not mentioned in this context, and that there was no phrase “books of the Prophets.”

Scholars approach these reconstructions in different ways. Also in *DJD* there have been different approaches towards the inclusion of reconstructions in *DJD* over the course of the years. In recent years, we have become accustomed to the inclusion of reconstructions, while the earlier volumes had no fixed system. This uncertainty is clearly visible in the different approaches of Barthélemy and Milik in *DJD* I (1955). Barthélemy hardly included any reconstructions of missing words, while Milik incorporated lengthy and often questionable reconstructions. Thus 4QDivre Moshe (4Q22), a composition for which no parallels are known, has been reconstructed very generously.¹²

2 Percentage of Scrolls Preserved

How fragmentary the scrolls are can be determined only when we are aware of their complete text as in the case of the biblical scrolls and some other works. The scrolls are actually much more fragmentary than we realize. The great majority of the biblical fragments do not exceed more than 5 percent of the complete books. For example, the Genesis scrolls cover only between

10 Restoration and translation according to E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *DJD* X, 59.

11 “The Non-attestation of a Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT,” *CBQ* 65 (2003): 202–214.

12 By the same token, some published texts do not indicate exactly where in the column the fragments were placed, while others are very specific. Thus in some publications, the structure of individual text columns within a given composition, extant or reconstructed, is often based on physically unconnected fragments placed in an extant or reconstructed column sequence. Some scholars were more insistent than others regarding the reconstruction of the column structure of the scroll made on the basis of the preserved fragments.

0.2 and 3 % of the book. In Exodus, most scrolls cover between 0.1 and 5 %, while 4QExod^c covers 13.5 % of the book, and 4QpaleoExod^m covers 36 %.¹³ In the long book of Isaiah, most scrolls from cave 4 cover between 0.1 and 7.0 %, while 4QIsa^b and 4QIsa^c cover 17 % and 5 % respectively. Of course, the large Isaiah scroll from cave 1 is complete. In the case of the nonbiblical scrolls, it is difficult to ascertain the percentage preserved because several ancient scrolls of what looks like the same composition contained different literary editions. A comparison of the scrolls of the Damascus Covenant with the medieval text of CD is therefore of limited value only. Three cave 4 manuscripts of the Damascus Covenant (4QD^{a,b,c}) contain respectively 38 %, 13 % and 3 % of the coverage of CD. The little fragment of the Targum of Leviticus, 4QtgLev (4Q156), contains no more than 1 % of the whole book. Likewise, 4QLXXLev^a and 4QLXXLev^b covered 1 % and 5 % respectively of the Greek translation, while 4QLXXNum and 4QLXXDeut covered 2.0 % and 0.1 % respectively. These small percentages should lead to some modesty with regard to our statements on the scrolls. At the same time, for the nonbiblical scrolls we often have no clue as to how much of the original composition has been preserved. Thus, in the case of the parabiblical texts relating to Jeremiah and Ezekiel published by Dimant in *DJD* XXX, we do not know whether these texts present for example 5, 10, or 30 % of the complete compositions.

3 Find-Sites of the Scrolls

Scholars worked out a detailed inventory system of the scrolls, but it is mostly based on information volunteered by the Bedouin and only very partially on controlled excavations. It is essential to know from which site and cave the documents derived, because several aspects of our analysis are based on such information. Cave 4 probably housed the community's central depository of scrolls, but we are not certain as to exactly which scrolls were found there. Thus 4QGen^b, a presumed Qumran scroll that is very close to the medieval MT, was suspected by its editor, Davila, to have derived from Murabba'at. Its script is late and among the Qumran scrolls this text, though fragmentary, is closer to the medieval text than the other scrolls.¹⁴ The decision as to whether or not this text derives from Qumran is thus rather central to our study of

13 The actual coverage of the words of the book is smaller, since I also counted single letters preserved as representing a complete verse.

14 J. Davila in *DJD* XII, 31 ("late Herodian, or perhaps even post-Herodian").

the biblical text, since all the proto-Masoretic texts from Qumran (57 texts)¹⁵ are somewhat removed from the medieval text, while those from the other find-sites in the Judean Desert are identical to the medieval text. This evidence leads to certain conclusions regarding Masada, Naḥal Ḥever, and Murabbaʿat, while 4QGen^b forms an exception. On the other hand, if this text indeed derived from Murabbaʿat, there is no case for its being a Qumran exception. It is not impossible that the Bedouin claimed that this text derived from Qumran in the hopes of receiving a better financial reward.

The same issue comes up with regard to the documentary texts 4Q342–348, 351–361 that are also rather exceptional among the Qumran texts. These texts contain deeds, letters, and accounts, types of documents rarely found at Qumran.¹⁶ Indeed, the collection of Qumran texts is exceptional among the corpora found in the Judean Desert, since all other Judean Desert corpora contain only or almost only documentary texts, while the Qumran corpus contains almost only literary texts. If some or all of 4Q342–361 derived from other sites in the Judean Desert, the Qumran collection would be more uniform. Indeed, 4Q347 and XḤev/Se 32 (XḤev/Se papDeed F) have been proven to be part of the same document deriving from Naḥal Ḥever. Further doubts on the alleged Qumran origin of these texts were raised by Cotton and Yardeni.¹⁷ These and additional doubts on the origin of the scrolls were summarized in a valuable study by S.A. Reed in 2007.¹⁸ For example, Reed pointed out that no more than ninety-four of the approximately 600 texts from cave 4 derived from controlled excavations.¹⁹ The original international team believed what was told them by the Bedouin, but it slowly dawned on scholars that this source of information was very questionable. After all, the Bedouin obtained a higher price for documents that were presented as “Qumran” or even Naḥal Ḥever. Likewise, most of the texts named Seiyal (Jordan) probably derived from Naḥal Ḥever (Israel), because the Bedouin did not want to admit in the 1950s that they had crossed the border into Israel and retrieved these texts from Naḥal Ḥever.²⁰

15 57 out of 127 texts that are sufficiently extensive for textual analysis.

16 For a list, see A. Lange in *DJD* XXXIX, 143–144.

17 A. Yardeni in *DJD* XXVII, 283–284.

18 S.A. Reed, “Find-Sites of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 14 (2007): 199–221. Among other things, Reed tabulated the finds in controlled archeological digs and by Bedouin, using the earlier analysis by S.J. Pfann in Tov–Pfann, *Companion Volume*.

19 Reed, “Find-Sites,” 206.

20 See E. Tov in *DJD* VIII, 1: “At first the exact location of the find was unknown, but

4 Position of the Fragments in the Caves

Very little is known about the placement of the fragments in the caves at the time of their discovery. In most cases, the Bedouin were the first to enter the caves, where they collected some fragments and brought them to antiquity dealers. Thus, the Bedouin are the sole source of the information that the cave 1 scrolls were found in jars.²¹ In his sworn statement, Muhammed ed-Deeb said that one of the two jars found in cave 1 contained three scrolls, two of which were covered with cloth, but we do not know which scrolls they were. Furthermore, we have no information at all regarding the placement of fragments in relation to each other. This lack of information greatly complicated the work of reconstruction. For one thing, the years-long identification work in the “scrollery” in the Rockefeller Museum would have been greatly facilitated had this and similar information been available.

5 Relation between the Contents of the Individual Caves

If we were to understand the relation between the contents of the individual caves we possibly would be in a better position to evaluate the writings found there. From a quantitative point of view, cave 4 housed the central depository, including multiple copies of the same works. The other caves contained at least one copy of every composition represented by multiple copies in cave 4, as noted by Devorah Dimant.²² Addressing the relation between the caves from a different angle, Stökl Ben Ezra distinguished between caves 1 and 4 that contained an older stage of the manuscript collection and caves 2, 3, 5, 6, 11

subsequent excavations in the ‘Cave of Horror’ in Naḥal Ḥever (Wādi Ḥabra) brought to light a few scraps of the same scroll, together with other documents and artifacts, so that the place of origin of the scroll is now known.”

21 See *Anton Kiraz’s Archive on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. G.A. Kiraz; Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias Press, 2005), 91 (undated statement relating to 1960–1965). See also W.W. Fields, *The Dead Sea Scrolls, A Short History* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006), 109. The cave 1 scrolls covered with cloth and placed in jars were probably considered especially precious. Thus H. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge and Leiden/New York/Cologne, 1998), 81.

22 D. Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” in *A Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990* (ed. D. Dimant and L.H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23–58 (30).

that represented more recent stages.²³ According to him, “[i]n one hypothetical scenario, the scrolls from Cave 1 were hidden there long before 68 CE, around the turn of the era when Qumran was destroyed by a fire after an attack. Cave 4 might have been used as an emergency hiding place, library, or as a depository already around the same time, though some manuscripts were added later.”²⁴

Most caves contain similar proportions of the various literary genres, biblical manuscripts, community compositions, and non-community compositions.²⁵ The only features characterizing the individual caves seem to be: (1) Cave 7 contains only Greek papyrus fragments (19 items), probably mainly biblical texts. (2) Most of the texts from cave 6 are Hebrew papyri (21 papyri out of a total of 31 items), including a few biblical papyri. This collection of texts must have derived from a special source, different from that of the main depository of texts in cave 4.²⁶ (3) A large percentage of the identifiable texts from cave 11 reflect the Qumran scribal system, or are sectarian, or are of interest to the Qumran community.²⁷

6 Number of Scrolls Preserved

We usually calculate the number of preserved Qumran scrolls as 930 items in our inventory, but we have no certainty at all that this number is even close to the truth. There are simply too many uncertainties relating to small fragments and scribal hands. It could be one hundred more or one hundred less. Obviously we do not know how many scrolls were originally deposited in the caves. Stegemann calculates the number of scrolls deposited in the caves at 1000, but we have no criteria for any type of calculation.²⁸

23 D. Stökl Ben Ezra, “Old Caves and Young Caves: A Statistical Reevaluation of a Qumran Consensus,” *DSD* 14 (2007): 313–333 (315–316).

24 Stökl Ben Ezra, “Old Caves,” 316.

25 Dimant, “Qumran Manuscripts,” 35.

26 According to M. Wise, *Thunder in Gemini* (JSPSup 15; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 130–132, this cave housed a collection of private study copies.

27 See my study “The Special Character of the Texts Found in Qumran Cave 11,” in Tov, *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 421–427. On the other hand, F. García Martínez, “The Study of the Texts from Qumran: A Groningen Perspective,” in his *Qumranica Minora 1: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism* (STDJ 63; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 297–310 (306–309) believes that cave 11 is as “sectarian” as cave 1.

28 *The Library of Qumran*, 79.

7 Relation between Multiple Copies

There is no standard formula for evaluating the relationship between multiple copies of the same composition. For example, if we approach the 36 copies now named “Psalms” as copies of the biblical book of Psalms, we may be very far from the truth. All these copies indeed contain psalms, but not all of them are biblical psalms. Only one Qumran copy reflects the Masoretic book of Psalms, 4QPs^c, while the other copies contain different collections of psalms. At least seven psalm collections from caves 4 and 11 contain psalms in a different sequence from that in MT, sometimes with additional psalms to those in the canon. If the view suggested by Sanders, Wilson, and Flint carries the day,²⁹ according to which these scrolls reflect alternative biblical Psalters, it implies that the psalm texts from caves 4 and 11 constitute the group of Qumran evidence that deviates most from MT. However, the arguments adduced in the past in favor of the assumption that 11QPs^a reflects a liturgical collection also hold with regard to the texts from cave 4,³⁰ and this view seems preferable to us. The deviations from MT pertain to both the sequence of the individual psalms and the addition and omission of psalms, among them non-canonical psalms.

Consequently, a common name for compositions is not always meaningful, since the scrolls may represent different editions of the same or similar compositions. Likewise, the different Jeremiah texts reflect two different editions of the book, a long one (4QJer^{a,c}) and a short one (4QJer^{b,d}), differing greatly in scope and sequence. The various copies of the Community Rule, the Damascus Document and the War Scroll also show evidence of different editorial versions of these compositions. As a result, the naming by modern editors of all the texts of S, D, M, or of the Psalms texts or those of Jeremiah with a single name is convenient, but may be misleading for some. Nevertheless, it is a correct procedure since books that developed in such a fashion in antiquity may have existed in various forms.

29 J.A. Sanders, *DJD* IV; G.H. Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (SBLDS 76; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985); Flint, *Psalms*.

30 11QPs^a contains prose as well as poetry sections showing the purpose of the collection (focus on David). To one of the psalms (Psalm 145), the scroll added liturgical antiphonal additions.

A Didactic and Gradual Approach towards the Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls*

The biblical Dead Sea Scrolls present a world of their own and it is now time to develop a didactic approach towards them. I am thinking especially about the question of how best to present these scrolls to scholars, students, and the public at large in introductory treatises. Most introductions do not gradually introduce concepts and types of literatures, but rather follow an internally logical sequence of presentation. Thus, an *Introduction to Hebrew Scripture* may start with concepts that are difficult for the novice reader and, as a result, it is often recommended not to read an *Introduction to Hebrew Scripture* in the first year of one's study, but rather at a more advanced stage.¹ By the same token, *Introductions* to the text of the Hebrew Bible, including my own,² are not didactic in their approach.³

The Dead Sea Scrolls feature prominently in all introductory analyses of textual criticism. They not only provide a wealth of information on the text of the Bible during the last three centuries BCE and the first two centuries CE, but also show what texts looked like in this early period. In order to fully realize the impact of the scrolls, they should be presented in conjunction with the other biblical texts from antiquity and the Middle Ages. Such a procedure would be much more powerful than an analysis of the scrolls together with the nonbiblical Judean Desert texts. After all, the Qumran biblical scrolls have

* For all 38 text samples see <http://www.sbl-site.org/assets/pdfs/pubs/DSS/Tov/pdf>.

1 At that point, one can better appreciate the sophistication of, for example, O. Eissfeldt's discussion of "The Pre-literary Stage: The Smallest Units and their Setting in Life" in his *Introduction*, 9. The reader of this book will have a better understanding of the Deuteronomist and of the complex literary development of Jeremiah after being exposed to other, less complicated books.

2 *TCHB*.

3 After an introductory chapter, *TCHB* presents the various textual witnesses, and describes the history of the biblical text in a theoretical chapter. There are additional chapters on the transmission history, the evaluation of readings, textual and literary criticism, conjectural emendation, and critical editions. P.K. McCarter, *Textual Criticism, Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible* (GBS; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), provides a more inductive and didactic approach.

more in common with the biblical texts from the other Judean Desert sites and the medieval MT than with the nonbiblical texts from Qumran. Further, presumably only a third of the scrolls were copied at Qumran. True, some Qumran scribes copied both biblical and nonbiblical scrolls,⁴ but the biblical scrolls themselves do not contain sectarian readings.⁵

Before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Hebrew text of the Bible was known mainly from the *medieval* manuscripts of MT and SP. Other sources are the medieval copies of the LXX, Peshitta, Targumim, and the Vulgate. An inductive approach to the scrolls should start with the data that were available before these manuscripts were found in 1947. If starting the analysis immediately with a description of the scrolls themselves, we would not be able to sense the impact of the immense revolution created by these new finds. Further, the human mind works from the known to the unknown by linking new data to data that are already known. We have to first analyze in detail MT, SP, and the LXX, since otherwise we cannot point out the closeness between a scroll and, for example, the LXX. We have no alternative but to proceed in this way, not only because the LXX was known before the scrolls, but also because the Greek Bible is so much better known than a few very fragmentary scrolls. In this analysis, we will start with the scrolls themselves. Proceeding in this way, we constantly think on two levels about the ancient and medieval sources. On the one hand, we compare the newly discovered ancient MT-like scrolls with the medieval text of MT, while on the other we are well aware that these ancient scrolls were the forerunners of MT and that we actually need to compare the latter with the former.

The system. A graphic presentation of selected scrolls accompanies our background description. These samples take the medieval MT as our point of reference, not only because it is the best-known text, but also because this is the accepted procedure in textual criticism. Our procedure involves a merely didactic device, and does not imply the centrality of that version. A variant is any detail differing from MT. In our samples of scrolls, *black* denotes identity with MT, while *red*, *blue*, *green*, and *pink* denote different types of variation from MT. The main idea behind this presentation is the gradual moving away from black to multi-colored texts. It should be stressed that the indication of these colors is subjective, although this subjectivity probably does not exceed

4 For an example, see E. Ulrich, "4QSam^c: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2Samuel 14–15 from the Scribe of the *Serek Hayyahad* (1QS)," *BASOR* 235 (1979): 1–25. For additional examples, see Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 23.

5 See E. Ulrich, "The Absence of 'Sectarian Variants' in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran," in idem, *The Bible as Book*, 179–195.

10 percent of the material. The purpose of these samples is to indicate graphically the relation between texts. The typological presentation is the focus of this study, and we do not suggest that the groups of texts developed in the way depicted here. Our main purpose is to elucidate the nature of the different groups.

1 Forerunners of the Medieval MT Found at Judean Desert Sites Other Than Qumran

Quite unexpectedly, the forerunners of MT, named proto-Masoretic were found at the Judean Desert sites. In the centuries around the turn of the era, the proto-MT had no vowels, accents, or verse division, but the consonantal text with its paragraph divisions already circulated. From the start of the finds of the scrolls, it was known that proto-Masoretic scrolls were found at Qumran, but only in the last decennium did it become clear that the ancestors of the medieval MT in its purest form were not found at Qumran, but at the Judean Desert sites other than Qumran, namely Wadi Murabba'at, Wadi Sdeir (Naḥal David), Naḥal Ḥever, Naḥal Še'elim, and Masada.⁶ In fact, these sites contain no biblical texts other than the proto-MT.

The study of these scrolls focuses on determining the amount of agreement between them and the medieval MT. The first step in such a procedure would be a detailed comparison of these scrolls with the most complete manuscript of the Ben-Asher tradition, Codex Leningrad (L). In this way one finds, for example, that MasLev^b, MasEzek, and MasPs^a,⁷ which provide a reasonable amount

6 This group comprises the following texts from five locations: Masada (Genesis, Leviticus [2], Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, Psalms [2]); Wadi Sdeir (Genesis); Naḥal Še'elim (Numbers); Naḥal Ḥever (Numbers [2], Deuteronomy, Psalms); and Murabba'at (Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Minor Prophets).

7 See Talmon, "Hebrew Fragments from Masada," in Talmon, *Masada* vi, 40–50, 59–75, 76–90. MasLev^b does not differ from Codex L in its 456 words and section divisions. MasEzek has 6 variants in 489 words (one difference per 81.5 words), while MasPs^a has 5 differences in 284 words (one variant per 56.8 words). The very few orthographical variants are not included in these calculations. The agreement between MasLev^b and Codex L pertains even to the intricacies of orthography, including details in which the orthography ad loc. goes against the conventions elsewhere in the book—for example, the defective form תמי[ם] in Lev 9:2, 3 (col. 1:11, 13) and the defective *hiph'il* form ויקרבו in Lev 9:9 (col. 1:21). See in detail Talmon, "Hebrew Fragments from Masada."

of text, deviate only minimally from MT.⁸ Both MasEzek and MasPs^a are luxury scrolls,⁹ dating to the second half of the first century BCE. Likewise, the Minor Prophets Scroll from Murabba'at (MurXII from c. 115 CE)¹⁰ and 5/6HevPs, a beautiful scroll from c. 115 CE (Sample 1), exactly reflect the medieval text.¹¹

The virtual lack of deviation of these scrolls from the medieval text indicates that they belong to the exact same tradition as the medieval MT manuscripts.¹² If the scrolls deviate at all from L, their deviations are similar in nature and number to the differences among the medieval MT manuscripts themselves.¹³ In our terminology, the scrolls from the sites other than Qumran belong to the "inner circle" of proto-rabbinic texts,¹⁴ which contained the consonantal framework of MT one thousand years or more before the time of the Masorah codices.

The first stage in the presentation of the Judean Desert texts involves a demonstration that several texts from antiquity reflect the very same text as MT, a text that the general public considers to be "*the* text of the Bible." Sample 1 reflects a text that is identical to MT. The historical explanation of this identity is that the people who left the Hebrew scrolls behind in the Judean Desert possessed biblical scrolls that closely reflected the instructions of the Jerusalem spiritual center for the writing of Scripture scrolls.¹⁵

8 Young, "Stabilization" provides detailed statistics for the deviations from MT in all the Masada manuscripts.

9 *Scribal Practices*, 125–129.

10 According to the statistics of Young, "Stabilization," this scroll deviates 17 times from Codex L in 3,774 words (one variant per 222 words), together with 26 differences in orthography. Similar statistics for this scroll (0.9% in words and 0.5% in orthography) are provided by M.G. Abegg, "1QIsa^a and 1QIsa^b: A Rematch," in *The Bible as Book*, 221–228 (223). These statistics stand in striking contrast to those for the Qumran scrolls (see below).

11 This text differs three times from MT in 605 words, in Ps 15:3 involving 4 words (one variant per 201.7 words).

12 Young, "Stabilization" provides statistics that highlight the high level of agreement between the medieval manuscripts of MT and the Masada manuscripts, as opposed to a lower level of such agreement with the proto-MT scrolls from Qumran.

13 Some medieval manuscripts are almost identical to one another in their consonantal text, such as L and the Aleppo Codex, while other codices from Leningrad and elsewhere are more widely divergent from these two choice manuscripts.

14 See my study "The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues," in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 171–188.

15 For details, see *TCHB*, 27–31.

Moving away from MT, which is known from all Hebrew editions and modern translations, we now turn to the proto-Masoretic scrolls from Qumran that are one step removed from MT.

2 Proto-Masoretic (“MT-Like”) Scrolls from Qumran

A large group of Qumran scrolls is very close to MT, close enough to be considered part of the same family. One of these, 4QGen^b (Sample 2),¹⁶ with no variation from Codex L, is similar in nature to those from the other Judean Desert sites, while 4QGen^g 17 (Sample 3) and 4QProv^b 18 are very close to MT.¹⁹ At the same time, most proto-Masoretic Qumran texts differ more widely from L, while they always agree with L against greatly deviating texts such as those mentioned below, for example, the LXX.²⁰

The nature of other scrolls typical of this group can be analyzed equally well because of their relatively well-preserved scope. Among the longer scrolls belonging to this group are 4QpaleoGen-Exod^l, 4QExod^c, 4QSam^b, 4QJer^a, and

¹⁶ 4QGen^b contains no variants in 361 words.

¹⁷ The preserved fragments of 4QGen^g contain 3 differences in 145 words (one variant per 48 words) and 9 orthographic variants. The color codes used from here onwards indicate linguistic variations (blue), orthographic variations (green), and all other variations (green).

¹⁸ 4QProv^b displays 2 differences in 125 words (one variant per 62.5 words).

¹⁹ Young, “Stabilization,” 373, shows that in the case of the Minor Prophets scrolls from cave 4 at Qumran, the divergence from MT is between one variant per 6.4 words and one per 41 words (mainly around 20 words), to be contrasted with the lack of deviation in six small Murabba’at fragments and one variant in 222 words in the Minor Prophets scroll. Likewise, in Leviticus, the Qumran manuscripts range between one variant per 4.5 to one per 50 words, as opposed to MasLev^b with no variants (*ibid.*, 374). The latter scroll is of equal size to some of the Qumran scrolls, so that the statistics are meaningful. These numbers are supported by additional tabulations for Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, and Psalms—in each case contrasted with scrolls from other sites in the Judean Desert (*ibid.*, 375–378). Young’s statistics are less meaningful for Psalms, since all the Qumran Psalms scrolls are probably liturgical as opposed to the non-liturgical character of the Psalms scrolls from Masada and Nahal Hever.

²⁰ The fifty-seven MT-like texts comprise 48 percent of the Qumran biblical corpus in the Torah (22 of the 46 texts) and 44 percent in the other books (33 of the 75 texts). These percentages are quite significant, and telling regarding the preferences of the Qumran community, but they are remote from the other sites in the Judean Desert, where all the texts belong to the inner circle of the medieval MT textual form.

4QJerc,²¹ exemplified by 1QIsa^b (Sample 4). The number of variations between 1QIsa^b and L is more substantial than those in Group 1, but clearly the two reflect the same family.²² The closeness between the two is visible when they are contrasted with the manifold deviations from MT of the popular text of 1QIsa^a. While the variation between 1QIsa^a (see Group 3 below) and L ranges between 9.9 and 18.5% in variants and in *addition* between 8.6 and 18.8% in orthographic variants, in 1QIsa^b the discrepancy amounts to only 4.3% in variants and 3.7% in orthographic variants.²³ These figures, provided by M. Abegg,²⁴ should be contrasted with the aforementioned minute deviations from MT in MurXII, with 0.9% in words and 0.5% in orthographic variants.

The combined differences between MT and 1QIsa^b tabulated for all the preserved fragments can also be expressed in terms of different groups of details,²⁵ using green for orthography and red for the other differences, in the same proportions as those in a single column in Sample 4.

*Deviations of 1QIsa^b from MT in the Entire Scroll*²⁶

Orthography	107
Addition of conjunctive <i>waw</i>	16
Lack of conjunctive <i>waw</i>	13

21 Most Torah manuscripts cannot be taken into consideration, since the opposition between MT and SP is not strong enough. The same pertains to the lack of opposition between MT and the LXX in Isaiah and Ruth.

22 Col. 21 presented in sample 4 (Isa 48:17–49:15) involves 10 variations in content, 5 in orthography, and 1 in language. The close relation between this scroll and MT was noticed by B.J. Roberts, “The Second Isaiah Scroll from Qumrân (1QIs^b),” *BJRL* 42 (1959): 132–144; Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle* 1992, cii–cxvi; G. Garbini, “1QIsa^b et le texte d’Isaïe,” *Hen* 6 (1984): 17–21.

23 The close relationship between L, the medieval representative of MT, and 1QIsa^b is matched by almost all the Isaiah texts from cave 4. In the sections in which 1QIsa^b overlaps with 4QIsa^b and 4QIsa^d, all are close to L. This also pertains to the following texts, which are close to MT and secondarily also to the LXX: 4QIsa^a, 4QIsa^e, 4QIsa^f, and 4QIsa^g (of these, 4QIsa^e, ^f probably differed most from the medieval manuscripts). It also pertains to the following texts, although they are too short for a clear judgment to be pronounced: 4QIsa^h, 4QIsaⁱ, 4QIsa^j, 4QIsa^k, 4QIsa^l, 4QIsa^m, 4QIsaⁿ, 4QIsa^b, 4QpapIsa^p, 4QIsa^q, and 4QIsa^r.

24 Abegg, “1QIsa^a,” 222–223.

25 See *TCHB*, 31–33.

26 In our system, blue denotes linguistic differences, but only when such differences are characteristic of the scribe. Since this feature cannot be determined for this scroll without an overall analysis, some of the differences indicated with red may have to be blue.

Article	4
Differences in letters	10
Missing letters	5
Differences in number	14
Differences in pronouns ²⁷	6
Different grammatical forms	24
Different prepositions	9
Different words	11
Minuses of words	5
Pluses of words	6
Different sequence	4

Likewise, 4QJer^a and 4QJer^c are both firm proto-Masoretic (MT-like) texts, but further removed from the medieval MT than 1QIsa^b. These two texts always follow MT against the LXX, yet differ in many small details from MT. 4QJer^a usually reflects the orthography of MT, even in unusual spellings,²⁸ differing in 32 instances in 160 partially preserved lines. Moreover, the orthography of 4QJer^c is very close to that of the medieval Masoretic tradition.²⁹

The presence of a moderate number of deviations from MT in the proto-Masoretic texts at Qumran, and not in the other Judean Desert texts, shows that the Qumran scrolls are one stage removed from the “inner cycle” texts represented at these other sites. The combined evidence of these two groups reveals the evidence relating to the frequency of MT-like fragments, which does not necessarily imply its textual pre-eminence.

3 Texts Differing from MT Mainly in Orthography and Morphology

Moving a small step away from the medieval MT, we now turn to the least meaningful type of deviations, namely in orthography (spelling). Orthography is the realization in writing of the spoken word and, accordingly, specific words

27 Some categories are undoubtedly linguistic, but we only classify variations as linguistic that are proven to characterize the scribe or period of the scribe, such as the lengthened pronominal suffixes (category 3) or the addition of the article in 1QIsa^a and other texts.

28 See DJD XV, 145–208 (150).

29 In 16 instances, 4QJer^c is fuller than MT, while in 6 cases MT is more full. Most instances involve the addition of a *waw* in 4QJer^c. Specifically, 4QJer^c adds *waw* 15 times and *yod* once; and MT adds *waw* 5 times and *yod* once. Of special interest is the unusual *plene* spelling in 4QJer^c of עֶקֶב; see DJD XV, 183.

may be written in different ways.³⁰ In Hebrew, such differences mainly refer to *defective* as opposed to *full* (*plene*) orthography, but they also include phonetic spellings.

A great deal of the aforementioned variations between the texts within MT family (Groups 1 and 2) referred to matters of spelling. Similar differences are also found between MT and other manuscripts. Thus, the pre-Samaritan manuscripts (Group 5) are usually fuller than those of MT family. In another group of texts, presumably produced by a scribal school that was active at Qumran and other places, personal preferences of scribes are clearly visible. The scribes involved were probably sectarian, since virtually all the sectarian manuscripts are written in a specific practice of orthography, morphology, and scribal habits. This practice is idiosyncratic, involving extremely full and often unusual spellings, combined with morphological idiosyncrasies.³¹ The longest text that displays these features is 1QIsa^a, as exemplified in Sample 5, covering the first column of that scroll. This column contains no less than 47 orthographic deviations from MT (green), 19 deviations in linguistic details—mainly morphology (blue)—and 26 differences in other details (red). As mentioned above, the distinction between the various categories is subjective, although the percentage of disagreement probably does not exceed 10%. The graphic picture of this column is one of total deviation from MT. However, when realizing that the scribe inserted most of the green and blue details himself, it is possible that his source did not differ so much from MT. When removing these elements, the resulting text, with differences from MT indicated in red only (Sample 6), shows the text that *may* have been used by the scribe of this scroll. The differences pertain to small details in content, such as the addition or omission of a conjunction. That text, with its 26 differences in red, differs more from MT than the texts in Groups 1 and 2, so that we are seemingly confronted with a different type of text. However, many, if not most, of the red details ought to be ascribed to the freedom of this scribe. Alongside his freedom in matters of

30 In fact, many words are written in different ways within the same language, at different periods, or in concurrent dialects without any difference in meaning. For example, many English words are spelled differently in Great Britain (e.g., *favour*, *specialise*) and in the United States (*favor*, *specialize*) without difference in meaning. Similarly, in Hebrew, there is no difference between *לא* and *לוא* nor between *שומרים* and *שמרים*.

31 Morphological variations relate to words that are pronounced differently, such as *הוא* in the majority tradition of the Hebrew text and *הוואה* in some Qumran texts. However, other scholars extend the discussion of orthography to include these forms as well. See F.M. Cross, "Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies," in *Madrid Qumran Congress*, 1–14.

orthography and morphology, he changed small details in the text, mainly in small contextual and linguistic harmonizations. As a result, 1QIsa^a was probably copied from a text close to MT.

In the case of 1QIsa^a, the evidence is actually complex since scribal differences between the two halves of that scroll (see ch. 26 in this volume) point to different features in each segment. Scribe B (cols. 28–54) has a fuller orthography and has more outspoken morphological preferences than scribe A (cols. 1–27), and he left out several small sections by mistake. Thus, in col. 50 from scribe B (Sample 7) the number of linguistic deviations from MT is larger than that in col. 1, while in col. 51, also from scribe B (Sample 8), the number of orthographic differences is much higher than in col. 1.³² The same type of differences is recognizable between scribes A and C of 1QH^a.³³

The features of this scribal school are also visible in overlapping sections (Sample 9) written by similar scribes, 4QIsa^c frgs. 9 ii, 11, 12 i, 52 (Isa 23:8–24:15) // 1QIsa^a cols. 18–19.³⁴ In this column, the two scribes agree 20 times against MT in their fuller orthography, and three times in linguistic variations. At the same time, they disagree among each other 14 times in matters of orthography, and twice in linguistic variations. The details are summarized in Sample 9 (lead text: 4QIsa^c), in which the orthographic divergences from MT common to 4QIsa^c and 1QIsa^a are indicated in a regular font, while differences between the two manuscripts are indicated in a smaller font. In this sample, content differences (in red) are not indicated.³⁵

4 Scrolls Written in the Paleo-Hebrew Script

Moving away in a different direction from the medieval MT, we encounter scrolls written in a special script. The scrolls described so far are written in the regular Hebrew script, also named Aramaic or square. These form the majority of the biblical scrolls. However, 11–12 scrolls are written in the ancient

32 Col. 1: red 26, blue 19, green 47; col. 50: red 42, blue 34, green 52; col. 51: red 51, blue 22; green 97.

33 See chapter 26 in this volume and *Scribal Practices*, 21–22.

34 P.W. Skehan & E. Ulrich, *DJD* xv, 7–144 (55–56).

35 The closeness between two other Qumran scribes writing in the same practice is also visible in two parallel texts of the *Community Rule* (1QS 10:4–12 // 4QS^d [4Q258 9:1–13]). Although there are differences in matters of orthography and morphology, more often than not the two agree.

Hebrew or paleo-Hebrew script.³⁶ In terms of contents, these do not form a special group since 4QpaleoGen-Exod^l and 4QpaleoDeut^r are close to MT,³⁷ 4QpaleoExod^m is close to SP, and 11QpaleoLev^a is textually non-aligned. The other texts are too small for analysis.

In many ways, these texts remain enigmatic since the texts sharing the same scribal traditions,³⁸ including almost total lack of scribal intervention, are of a different textual background. There is no reason to assume that the Qumranites themselves wrote complete texts in paleo-Hebrew characters; it has been suggested cautiously that Sadducees wrote these texts.³⁹ MT-like paleo-Hebrew texts resemble the proto-Masoretic texts from Qumran (above, Group 2), while the pre-Samaritan nature of 4Qpaleo-Exod^m forms the link with the next category.

5 “Pre-Samaritan” Scrolls and SP

The deviations from MT discussed so far pertain to small inner-Masoretic variations and major differences in orthography and morphology. All these differences are not important with respect to contents. Moving further away from MT, we now turn to a group of texts which inserted content changes (red) in the underlying text. In this group, we can trace MT or a similar text as the origin of the texts discussed here, while in the next groups we are less certain. The colors indicated in the texts are mainly red for content changes, but there is also some green and blue for orthographic and linguistic differences.

The group discussed here, one of the surprises of the Qumran discoveries, involves a small number of texts that are amazingly close to the medieval SP, which supposedly had ancient origins. This ancient origin has now been confirmed because of the almost complete identity of SP with a group of Qumran texts. These texts are therefore named “pre-Samaritan” and their major representatives are 4QpaleoExod^m, 4QNum^b, 4QExod-Lev^f, and secondarily 4QLev^d. All these texts, together with SP, are named the “SP group.”⁴⁰ The two

36 See *TCHB*, 103–106.

37 The orthography of 4QpaleoGen-Exod^l (210 lines) is often fuller than MT (29 times), although it is not excessively full. For details, see P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J. Sanderson, *DJD* IX. 4QpaleoDeut^r is of a similar nature; see *ibid.*, 133–135.

38 For details, see *Scribal Practices*, 254–256.

39 *Ibid.*, 246–248.

40 See chapter 27 in this volume.

subgroups of the SP group are not identical, since the SP inserted a very thin layer of sectarian changes in the earlier texts. Col. 1 of 4QpaleoExod^m, shown in Sample 10, shows a few small changes from MT in red, green, and blue,⁴¹ while major changes vis-à-vis MT involving several lines of text are indicated in cols. 5 (Sample 11) and 38 (Sample 12). These changes involve the addition of verses on the basis of other contexts, added at a relatively late stage in the development of Hebrew Scripture.⁴² Thus, in col. 5 in Sample 11, in Exod 9:1–5 Moses is told to approach Pharaoh and inform him of the plague of pestilence. However, the text does not specify that Moses indeed performed this command. The Qumran scroll (first lines of col. 5) adds several lines of text after Exod 9:5 specifying exactly what Moses did; this goal was reached by repeating the text of 9:1–5 in a slightly altered version. The same addition is found in SP. Similar additions were made to the story of all the ten plagues in Exodus 7–11; see col. 5:28–32 (= 9:19b SP, before the plague of hail) also in Sample 11. Col. 38 1–2 (= Exod 32:10b SP) in Sample 12 adds a segment to Moses' speech from the parallel section in Deut 9:13.⁴³

The texts in Samples 10–12 display the relation between 4QpaleoExod^m and MT in three colors. Since the Qumran scrolls are compared with MT, they do not show their closeness to SP, which is shown by the comparison of the scrolls with SP in Samples 13–15.⁴⁴ These samples show that the Qumran scroll reflects the same text as SP, including the large editorial additions. Most of the text of the scroll is now black, with a sprinkling of orthographic, linguistic and other

41 The orthography of the earlier text was changed in small details in 4QpaleoExod^m to a more user-friendly form so as to facilitate the reading of unvocalized texts. Further, difficult linguistic forms were eliminated and the text was internally harmonized (the same words being used in immediate and sometimes remote contexts).

42 The editing involved is meant to impart a more perfect and internally consistent structure to the text. The editing is inconsistent, that is, certain details were changed while others of similar nature were left untouched. The editor was attentive to what he considered imperfections within and between units. What disturbed him especially was the incongruence—according to a formalistic view of Scripture—of details within and between specific stories. In order to reduce such incongruence, details were repeated or added. In this regard, special attention was paid to the presentation of the spoken word, especially by God, which was added to the text when the reviser was able to add the details from a similar context.

43 By the same token, the pre-Samaritan texts from Qumran and SP added many sections in Exodus and Numbers that are parallel to Moses' summarizing speech in Deuteronomy 1–3.

44 The comparison is based on the edition of Tal –Florentin, *Samaritan Version*.

differences from SP. Thus the large editorial additions (in red) of the scroll to MT disappear when compared with SP.

Somewhat more complex are Samples 16–18, displaying the text of another pre-Samaritan text, 4QNum^b. This scroll displays the same type of large and small deviations from MT as 4QpaleoExod^m (Num 20:13b = Deut 3:23–27; Num 21:11a–12b = Deut 2:19, 17–19; Num 21:11b = Deut 2:9; Num 21:12b = Deut 2:17–19; Num 21:20b = Deut 2:24–25; Num 27:23b = Deut 3:21). In all these long pluses, 4QNum^b agrees with SP, as indicated in Samples 19–21 in which the scroll is compared with SP. However, the analysis of this scroll is more complicated since some of its readings deviating from MT are shared with the LXX, especially in small harmonizing changes, as indicated in the next category. In Samples 19–21, these agreements are indicated in italics.

6 Texts Close to the Presumed Hebrew Source of the LXX

With each new category, we move further away from MT. The LXX differs much from MT, and one of the great surprises of the Qumran caves was the discovery of Hebrew scrolls that are very close to the LXX, translated between 250 and 100 BCE.

While 4QJer^b is almost identical to the reconstructed *Vorlage* of the LXX, a few other scrolls are very close to that version, sometimes in its characteristic features. 4QJer^b,⁴⁵ bear a strong resemblance to the LXX in characteristic details, with regard both to the arrangement of the verses and to their shorter text.⁴⁵ Also close to the LXX, though not to the same extent, 4QDeut^q (Sample 22), 4QSam^a (close to the main tradition of the LXX and LXX^{Luc}; Samples 23–24 and 25–26),⁴⁶ and 4QSam^b, and secondarily also 4QNum^b (Samples 19–21 indicate extra-Masoretic agreements of that scroll with SP and the LXX).

Sample 22 presents the disagreements of 4QDeut^q with MT, together with its agreements with the LXX. 4QDeut^q and the LXX contain a few extra lines beyond MT at the end of the Song of Moses (Deut 32:43);⁴⁷ it seems that MT

45 See *TCHB*, 319–327.

46 For an analysis, see chapter 25 in this volume. F.M. Cross and R.J. Saley, “A Statistical Analysis of the Textual Character of 4QSamuel^a (4Q51),” *DSD* 13 (2006): 46–60, describe this scroll as follows: “4QSam^a stands firmly rooted in the Hebrew textual tradition reflected in the Old Greek ...” (p. 54).

47 The polytheistic content of the scroll and the LXX has all the marks of originality, as similar references to the pantheon of gods are found elsewhere in the Bible, and often in earlier

removed these expressions of polytheistic beliefs. The Qumran scroll and the LXX thus agree in very important details.

Samples 23–26 show the differences between MT and 4QSam^a, almost all in matters of content (red). A mere glance at this column shows to what extent these samples differ from the types of divergence in 1QIsa^a (Samples 5–8), which pertain mainly to orthography and language. Many of the differences in red pertain to significantly divergent literary strata in the book. Samples 23–24 display the relation between 4QSam^a and MT, while samples 25–26 show the same discrepancies, this time with an indication in italics of scroll readings agreeing with the LXX.

7 “Non-aligned” (“Independent”) Scrolls

The last group of texts, and the most difficult to evaluate, consists of “non-aligned” or “independent” sources—that is, scrolls that are not close to MT, SP, or LXX. In some cases, the relation is determined mainly on the basis of statistical data when independent scrolls agree sometimes with MT against the other texts in small details, and sometimes with SP and/or the LXX against the remainder. However, the most manifestly non-aligned texts are those that contain (groups of) readings that diverge significantly from the other texts in major content features, such as the possible sequence differences in 4QJosh^a (Sample 27). The point at which the sequence deviates from MT is indicated with a single line in pink, but one could also present in pink the remainder of the context in 4QJosh^a (Sample 28) or in MT. For an analysis of this scroll, see chapter 10 in this volume.

4QSam^a, closely related to the *Vorlage* of the LXX, reflects independent features as well. 4QReworked Pentateuch (4QRP = 4Q158, 4Q364–367), which differs more from MT than the other Qumran texts (Samples 29–31), is a truly non-aligned group of texts. This composition, published as nonbiblical (*DJD* XIII), and later reclassified as a Bible text,⁴⁸ exhibits long stretches of uninterrupted Scripture text such as found in either MT or SP groups.⁴⁹ At the same time,

West Semitic literature, for example: the cuneiform texts found at Ugarit, in present-day Syria, dating to around 1200 BCE.

48 See chapters 1 and 4 in this volume.

49 The pre-Samaritan text is clearly the underlying text of 4Q158 and 4Q364, and possibly so in the case of 4Q365, see *DJD* XIII, 187–196 (192–196). A. Kim, “The Textual Alignment of the Tabernacle Sections of 4Q365 (Fragments 8a–b, 9a–b i, 9b ii, 12a i, 12b iii),” *Textus* 21 (2002): 45–69, shows that 4Q365 is not close to SP.

this text is non-aligned; it rearranges some Torah pericopes, and it contains a small number of extensive exegetical additions. In these pluses, 4QRP typologically resembles the Hebrew compositions behind the Greek 1Kings, Esther, and Daniel. Sample 29 shows how 4QRP^c frg. 12a–b displays several small variations in orthography and content, while Sample 30 shows a large addition in frg. 23. This addition lists nonbiblical festivals after Lev 24:2. Another such large addition is 4QRP^c frg. 6a ii and 6c 1–7 (the “Song of Miriam”) before Exod 15:22 (Sample 31).⁵⁰ There are not many such truly non-aligned texts at Qumran.

Within the framework of non-aligned biblical texts, we now turn to three subgroups that differ much from MT and the other biblical texts. If these texts are considered biblical, some of them should probably be presented as mostly red or pink.⁵¹ However, in my view, most likely these are not Scripture texts in the usual sense of the word, and therefore should not be presented together with the other texts. This aspect of my presentation is more subjective than the other groups.

7.1 *Excerpted Texts*

The common denominator of excerpted texts is that they present large or small segments of the biblical text in a sequence different from MT.⁵² Some excerpted texts were probably made for liturgical purposes (*tefillin*, some manuscripts of Exodus and Deuteronomy), while other texts were written for sundry literary purposes (4QCant^{a, b}, 4QTestimonia [4Q175]). If the characterization of these scrolls as excerpted and abbreviated texts is correct, their major omissions and transpositions should be disregarded in the text-critical analysis, but other deviations from MT may be taken into consideration, for example in the case of the *tefillin*.⁵³

50 Frg. 23 may have belonged to a different manuscript from 4Q365, close to the *Temple Scroll*, and is sometimes named 4Q365a. For discussion, see E. Tov and S. White, *DJD* XIII, 187–352 (292–295). Such a solution may not be invoked in the case of frg. 6, which remains problematical.

51 Indeed, all these texts are listed everywhere as being biblical, and have been given names of biblical texts.

52 For an analysis, see my study “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16 (1995): 581–600.

53 See D. Nakman, “The Contents and Order of the Biblical Sections in the *Tefillin* from Qumran and Rabbinic Halakhah: Similarity, Difference, and Some Historical Conclusions,” *Cathedra* 112 (2004): 19–44 (Heb.); D. Rothstein, *From Bible to Murabba’at: Studies in the Literary, Scribal and Textual Features of Phylacteries and Mezuzot in Ancient Israel and Early Judaism*, unpub. Ph.D. diss., University of California, 1992.

Samples 32–34 display the deviations of 4QCant^b from MT in small details (Sample 32) as well as its long omissions. 4QCant^a presents a similar text.⁵⁴ The long omissions referred to in the headers of the fragments are indicated in pink in the text. Sample 33 presents a single line in pink, while Sample 34 presents the remainder of the context in pink without indicating the smaller differences. In this scroll, Cant 3:6–8 and 4:4–7 are lacking. However, we believe that this text represents an ancient excerpted text, so that it should probably not be discussed here.

7.2 *Liturgical Texts*

Another subgroup contains non-aligned texts that are “liturgical,” such as 4QExod^d, 4QDeut^{l,n}, and most of the Psalms scrolls from Caves 4 and 11.⁵⁵ The question of whether several of the Psalms scrolls from Qumran reflect a biblical text, parallel to MT but deviating from it, or liturgical anthologies has preoccupied scholars for some time. Sample 35 records a segment of 4QPs^a, one of the independent Psalters from Qumran. The unusual sequence of Psalm 38 followed by Psalm 71 is indicated with a single pink line. The full extent of deviation of Psalm 71 is indicated with pink without entering into detail regarding the smaller differences (Sample 36). If this is a regular Psalms manuscript, as suggested by P.W. Flint,⁵⁶ both its small and large deviations should be taken into consideration. On the other hand, if this Psalter, as well as most other Qumran Psalters, is taken as a liturgical collection,⁵⁷ at least the large deviations should not be presented within this framework.

7.3 *Rewritten Bible Compositions*

These compositions are of limited relevance in the textual analysis because of the uncertainty regarding the text that lay before the author, especially because of the author's tendencies.⁵⁸ They are most certainly no biblical texts. 11QT^a elaborates on the biblical text and often abbreviates it. Sample 37 shows that the great majority of the words in 11QT^a 53:2–8 present Deut 12:20–25 of MT, with several inversions and omissions of phrases occurring twice in MT (for example, Deut 12:21, 22). The sky-blue color in Sample 37 indicates the elements in 11QT^a that are parallel to MT, though not necessarily identical to them. Sample 38

54 E. Ulrich describes these texts as earlier than or parallel with MT: “The Qumran Biblical Scrolls and the Biblical Text,” in Schiffman, *DSS*, 51–59 (57–58).

55 See chapters 16 and 22 in this volume.

56 Flint, *Psalms*.

57 See chapter 4, note 11.

58 See chapter 14 in this volume.

shows the many differences between 11QT^a and MT, mainly in orthography and language. The differences in red in that sample do not pertain to textual analysis since they involve either stylistic changes (inversions, shortening, addition of routine phrases) or the author's tendencies (change from third to first person singular with regard to God).

8 Epilogue

This exercise in method offers a graphic and didactic presentation of the differences between the various groups of the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls in their relation to MT, SP, and other sources. The samples took the medieval MT as point of reference, not only because it is the best-known text, but also because this is the accepted procedure in textual criticism. In these samples, black denotes identity with MT, while red, blue, green, and pink denote different types of deviations from MT. The main idea behind the presentation is to indicate the typology of the *gradual* moving away from the black of a text like MT to multi-colored texts. This is a didactic device that in the first place graphically depicts the relationship between the extant textual sources. I suggest that this exercise in method more or less resembles what happened in reality. In the Torah this exercise probably is close to the presumed development of the text,⁵⁹ while in the other books the development is more hypothetical. The process of the development of the biblical text was much more complex than depicted here, since several texts preceded MT and since most of the evidence is actually lacking. Our analysis is no more objective than others, but by graphically indicating the relationship between texts we hope to have succeeded in providing a better picture of the complicated web of relations between the texts representing the facts known in 2014.

59 See chapter 16 in this volume.

The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Textual History of the Masoretic Bible

The scrolls found in various places in the Judean Desert have been hailed as a source of knowledge for the biblical text. Foremost among them are several types of scrolls that were unknown before 1947, especially the so-called proto-Samaritan scrolls, Hebrew scrolls resembling the Septuagint, and scrolls written in unusual forms of orthography. 4QSam^a provides very important insights into the early text of Samuel, 4QSam^b presents an orthography system that is earlier than that of MT,¹ and yet other scrolls are “successive revised literary editions.”² The research of the biblical text in the last centuries BCE has thus been advanced significantly for all these groups of texts. Furthermore, the fact that so many different scrolls of a varied nature have been found in a limited geographic area has been considered indicative of the textual variety of the biblical text in ancient Israel in these early centuries.

Within the framework of the contribution of the Judean Desert scrolls to textual criticism, all scrolls are compared with MT, but insufficient attention has been paid to MT itself. The main observation made regarding MT is that early texts resembling MT were found in the Judean Desert, thus providing us with information about that text 1000 years before the date of the Masoretic texts from the early Middle Ages. The fact that we can pre-date the text of MT is very important, but not revolutionary, as scholars have assumed for a long time that MT must have been in use in the last centuries BCE and the first centuries CE since the biblical text quoted in rabbinic literature is identical to MT.

Summarizing my earlier research, I suggest that there is a need to present the facts about MT in a different fashion. We believe that the facts that are now

1 F.I. Andersen & D.N. Freedman, “Another Look at 4QSam^b,” *RevQ* 14 (1989): 7–29; Tov, *TCHB*, 211.

2 The term is used by E. Ulrich, “Clearer Insight into the Development of the Bible: A Gift of the Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)* (ed. A.D. Roitman et al.; STDJ 93; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2011), 119–137 (128). This group is described similarly in my own studies, albeit less prominently.

known about the finds of MT in the Judean Desert are very significant, if not revolutionary. Our knowledge of MT is greatly enhanced by the Judean Desert scrolls because of a special type of information contained in them relating to the distribution of the various texts at the different find sites. It does not suffice to say that some or many texts “merely” confirm the medieval MT, since there is a story behind these texts. The novel aspects relating to these texts from the Judean Desert pertain not only to the new data themselves, but also to a better understanding of the medieval sources that were known prior to the Qumran finds.³

1 Identity of the Judean Desert Texts and the Medieval Tradition of MT

All the texts that were found at sites in the Judean Desert other than Qumran display virtually complete identity with the medieval tradition of MT.⁴ The Judean Desert texts are compared with codex L (Leningrad codex B19^A), being the best complete representative of the medieval text. This group of twenty-five texts from the Judean Desert includes both the earlier site of Masada (texts written between 50 BCE and 30 CE) and the later sites of Wadi Murabbaʿat, Wadi Sdeir, Naḥal Ḥever, Naḥal Arugot, and Naḥal Šeʿelim dating to the period of the Bar-Kochba revolt in 132–135 CE (texts written between 20 and 115 CE).⁵

Fragments of the Torah, Isaiah, and the Minor Prophets were found in Wadi Murabbaʿat⁶ and fragments of Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Psalms were found in Naḥal Ḥever.⁷ The Masada fragments include texts from Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, and Psalms.⁸ We also include a text of Genesis from Wadi Sdeir,⁹ a

3 See “The Biblical Texts from the Judaeen Desert: An Overview and Analysis,” in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 128–154.

4 The socio-religious differences between the two types of text are best visible when texts from the same period are juxtaposed. All the texts copied from the beginning of the first century CE until 65 CE from Qumran are of a varied nature, with only very few reflecting MT while the texts from the same period (until 115 CE) from Judean Desert sites other than Qumran only reflect MT.

5 For the chronological data, see the lists of B. Webster in *DJD* XXXIX, 351–446.

6 See Mur 1–3, 88 in *DJD* II, 75–80, 181–205.

7 *DJD* XXXVIII, 133–182.

8 S. Talmon in Talmon, *Masada* VI, 1–149.

9 *DJD* XXXVIII, 117–124.

Leviticus scroll from Naḥal Arugot (75–100 CE),¹⁰ and the published fragments from an unknown site named “X”.¹¹

Good sources for the analysis of the Masada fragments are the somewhat longer texts MasPs^a ¹² dating to the end of the first century BCE and MasLev^b dating to 30 BCE–30 CE.¹³ Both texts are identical with the medieval texts. Likewise, the differences between the well-preserved texts 5/6HevPs dating to 50–68 CE and MurXII dating to c. 115 CE and the medieval codex L are minimal, as shown in a detailed study by Young.¹⁴ Recognizing that few differences exist between codex L and the other medieval sources of MT, we note that these differences are of the same nature as those between codex L and the Judean Desert texts. The relation between codex L and the ancient Judean Desert texts is thus one of identity,¹⁵ and we therefore note that the consonantal framework of MT changed very little over the course of more than one thousand years.

So far, we have discussed only the Judean Desert texts found at sites other than Qumran. On the other hand, the Qumran scrolls are not identical to codex L. Many Qumran scrolls, copied between 250 BCE and 68 CE are very similar to codex L, but not to the same degree as the other Judean Desert texts, and they form a sizable group among the Qumran scrolls. According to our calculations, in the Torah these texts (22 items) comprise 48 percent of the Qumran biblical texts and in the other books (33 items) they comprise 44 percent.¹⁶ All the texts display several differences in small details and orthography,¹⁷ but they always are close to L, and together with L they differ from other textual witnesses. It is hard to express in statistical terms the exact relation between these

10 H. Eshel, Y. Baruchi, R. Porat, “Fragments of a Leviticus Scroll (ArugLev) Found in the Judean Desert in 2004,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 55–60.

11 For details, see Tov, *Revised Lists*, 126–129.

12 This scroll reflects only four orthographical differences and six other deviations from L in small details.

13 The agreement between MasLev^b and the medieval text pertains even to the intricacies of orthography, including details in which the orthography *ad loc.* goes against the conventions elsewhere in the book. See chapter 21, n. 7.

14 Young, “Stabilization.”

15 There has been some discussion as to which terminology best describes the consonantal framework of MT extant in the last century BCE, but the fact of their virtual identity is beyond doubt.

16 See *TCHB*, 108.

17 An exception is 4QGen^b, which is identical to codex L, but it only contains parts of Gen 1:1–4:11.

proto-Masoretic Qumran texts and MT, but these texts are clearly somewhat removed from MT in small details. For example, in the fragmentary col. XXI of 1QIsa^b covering Isa 48:17–49:15 (20 verses) one finds 20 differences all of which concern only minutiae: 9 differences in orthography and 11 minor, mainly linguistic, differences. The complete column of 1QIsa^b would have deviated more from MT and this number is definitely greater than in the case of the Judean Desert scrolls from other sites. In the case of 4QJer^a, we witness few orthographical deviations from MT, and also a relatively large number of small content differences: the fragmentary text of col. XI (Jer 17:8–26) contains 5 orthographical differences, 2 other differences, and an excessive number of 12 corrections (towards the base text of the scroll = MT) showing a great number of scribal errors and much scribal activity. With the help of Young's study, the relation between codex L and the different types of Judean Desert scrolls can now be expressed in statistical terms. In this way, it is recognized that the Qumran scrolls differ much more from codex L than the scrolls from the other sites. In Young's system, the ratio of variation for each text is calculated by dividing the number of preserved words by the number of variants. The lower that number, the greater is the divergence from codex L. For example, in the well-preserved Minor Prophets Scroll from Murabba'at, there are 222 words between any two variants, while in the Qumran scrolls this number varies between 6 and 42.¹⁸

To this identity of the Judean Desert proto-Masoretic texts and the medieval MT we add an important, hitherto unknown feature in the layout of the poetical texts as well as a remark about the sense divisions. While most of the poetry texts in MT are written as running texts, MT presented the books Job, Proverbs, and Psalms, some songs of the Torah, the song of Deborah, and the acrostic in Lamentations as poetry in a stichographic layout. This feature was foreshadowed by the proto-Masoretic texts from Qumran and elsewhere. In these texts, a stichographic layout is evidenced for two poems in the Torah (Exodus 15; Deuteronomy 32), Psalms (especially Psalm 119), Proverbs, Lamentations, and Job, as well as Ben Sira and one nonbiblical text, 4QMessianic Apocalypse (4Q521). Most of these poetical texts are also transmitted in prose format in other Judean Desert texts, and it is not easy to discover why some manuscripts present a prose layout, and others a stichographic arrangement. The differences are neither in the dates of the manuscripts nor in their function, for example as liturgical versus non-liturgical sources. The solution lies in the textual character of the texts. The twenty-seven poetical texts from the Judean Desert that do

¹⁸ Young, "Stabilization," 373.

not have a stichographic arrangement are not Masoretic, while the thirty texts that do display such an arrangement are both Masoretic and non-Masoretic, mainly displaying two stichs per line separated by a space. The proto-Masoretic texts are thus transmitted only in stichographic arrangement and I therefore suggest that the proto-Masoretic scribes developed the stichographic layout. These scribes reflect the same tradition as that of the medieval MT, both positively and negatively. In short, we suggest that the stichographic layout presents another link between the consonantal frameworks of the proto-Masoretic texts and the medieval MT.¹⁹

An analysis of the section divisions, that is, open and closed sections, points in the same direction. Ever since the study by Oesch,²⁰ scholars have compared the section divisions of the Dead Sea Scrolls with the medieval texts. These comparisons highlighted differences between most sources, but at the same time they can also aid us to point to identity between the proto-Masoretic texts and the medieval MT. We note an identity between the medieval MT and a group of the Judean Desert texts, namely the proto-Masoretic texts. This identity is so striking that in the case of the Minor Prophets Scroll from Murabba'at Oesch noted: "... the section division of MurXII ... does not differ more from the section division of MT than the individual manuscripts differ from one another."²¹ Indeed, in this well-preserved scroll its 55 instances of section division agree with the medieval text regarding the position of the division, and furthermore, in some 90 percent of the instances they display the same type of section division when compared with individual medieval manuscripts.²² In the less sizable, but still extensive Masada scrolls of Leviticus (MasLev^b) and Ezekiel (MasEzek), Talmon²³ noted the same identity.²⁴

19 See chapter 23 in the present volume.

20 J.M. Oesch, Petucha und Setuma, *Untersuchungen zu einer überlieferten Gliederung im hebräischen Text des Alten Testament* (OBO 27; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979).

21 Ibid., 288.

22 The differences between the two types of sections, P[etuhah] or S[etumah] in the remaining 20 percent is less relevant, since scribes constantly had to adapt the size of the section division to the different parameters of the manuscripts.

23 Talmon, *Masada*, 40–50, 59–75.

24 In another category, the indication of κ/Q, the medieval texts differed from the Judean Desert texts because the *Qere* forms were probably added to the text at a later stage. See E. Tov, "The *Ketiv-Qere* Variations in Light of the Manuscript Finds in the Judean Desert," in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 199–205.

2 Background of the Identity between the Texts

The virtual identity of the *Judean Desert* texts with the medieval text of MT is a fact, in my view, while the description of many *Qumran* texts as being close to MT is a matter of interpretation. It remains subjective to characterize a *Qumran* text as being close to codex L, but such a characterization is probably correct as long as the number of deviations from L is “small.” Ideally, the text common to codex L and the *Qumran* text should differ from other ancient witnesses, but this condition cannot always be met. While the *Qumran* texts cannot be evaluated easily, the character of the *Judean Desert* texts from other sites is easier to understand. The remarkable fact of their identity with the medieval text of MT has led to some speculation about the background of the *Judean Desert* texts, especially by myself.²⁵

The key for understanding the background of the different scrolls found in the *Judean Desert* lies in the correlation between their nature and the socio-religious background of the archeological sites. What the earlier site of Masada (texts written between 50 BCE and 30 CE) and the Bar-Kochba sites (texts written between 20 and 115 CE) have in common, in contradistinction to the *Qumran* scrolls, is that the people who left the scrolls behind at these sites (the Masada rebels and the freedom fighters of Bar Kochba) closely followed the guidance of the Jerusalem spiritual center in religious matters.²⁶ They also exclusively used the “proto-rabbinic” (“proto-Masoretic”) text embraced by the spiritual leadership of Jerusalem. Some scholars even stress the priestly influence on the leadership of the revolt.²⁷

As a further background explanation of the virtual lack of differences between the copies of MT through the ages, I pointed to the precision in the copying of the scrolls described in rabbinic literature.²⁸ Rabbinic sources, deriving from a period later than the *Judean Desert* evidence, provide descriptions of earlier textual procedures, which were also their own. In these descriptions, we read about a master copy of the Torah found in the Temple Court, and about

25 “The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues,” in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 171–188.

26 It is not impossible that both cases involved people who fled from Jerusalem bringing with them Jerusalem scrolls. In Masada these refugees were joined by refugees from *Qumran*. See E. Tov, “A *Qumran* Origin for the Masada Non-biblical Texts?” *DSD* 7 (2000): 57–73.

27 See D. Goodblatt, “The Title *Nasi* and the Ideological Background of the Second Revolt,” in *The Bar Kokhva Revolt: A New Approach* (ed. A. Oppenheimer & U. Rappaport; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi, 1984), 113–132.

28 See chapter 6 in the present volume.

scrolls copied from or revised according to that copy. The term *sefer ha-‘azarah* (ספר העזרה, with a variant ספר עזרא, the book of Ezra)²⁹ probably referred only to the Torah,³⁰ but it stands to reason that (the) other books of Scripture were also found in the temple.³¹ The little that is known about the scroll from the Temple Court is consonant with the Judean Desert texts (except for those from Qumran).

This comparative analysis of the Judean Desert scrolls and rabbinic literature is strengthened by an additional argument: To find identical ancient and medieval textual evidence is not very common; it represents an unusual situation requiring explanation. I therefore turn to the question of how such textual identity was achieved among the Judean Desert scrolls internally, between these scrolls and the temple copies, and between these scrolls and the medieval manuscripts. The logic prevailing today could not have been different from that of ancient times. It seems to us that identity between two or more texts could have been achieved only *if all of them were copied from a single source, in this case (a) master copy (copies) located in a central place, which was probably the temple until 70 CE, and subsequently another central location (Jamnia?).* The textual unity described above has to start somewhere and the assumption of master copies is therefore necessary.³² The depositing and preserving of holy books in the temple is parallel to the modern concept of publication as implied by various references in rabbinic literature,³³ and can be paralleled by evidence from ancient Egypt, Greece, and Rome.³⁴

We suggested that the internal identity of this group of texts, subsequently perpetuated in the medieval tradition,³⁵ was created because they were copied from or revised according to the master copies in the temple. It also seems that the type of scrolls found in the Judean Desert is referred to in rabbinic literature.

29 See *m. Kel.* 15.6; *m. Moed Qatan* 3.4; *b. b. Bat.* 14b; *b. Yoma* 69a–b; *y. San.* 2.20c. This variant, occurring among other places in *m. Moed Qatan*, is considered the original reading by R. Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 84, 102.

30 This is evident from the discussion in *b. B. Bat.* 14b and from the names of the three scrolls found in the Temple Court relating to passages in the Torah (see the next note).

31 Thus, according to *m. Yom.* 1.6, the elders of the priesthood read to the High Priest on the eve of the Day of Atonement from Job, Ezra, Chronicles, and Daniel.

32 This suggestion was already voiced by S. Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie* (Leipzig: Gustav Fock, 1912; repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1966), 111.171 and S. Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (2d ed.; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1962), 22.

33 See Tov, *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 178, n. 31.

34 See *ibid.*, n. 32.

35 See *ibid.*, 179, n. 41.

In other words, we suggest that the precise proto-Masoretic texts found in the Judean Desert can be identified as some of the “corrected scrolls” mentioned in rabbinic literature.

We surmised that a carefully copied biblical text such as those found in the Judean Desert is mentioned in rabbinic literature as a “corrected scroll,” *sefer muggah*.³⁶ The temple employed professional *maggihim*, “correctors” or “revisers,” whose task it was to safeguard precision in the copying of the text: “*Maggihim* of books in Jerusalem received their fees from the temple funds” (*b. Ketub. 106a*).³⁷ This description implies that the correcting procedure based on the master copy in the temple was financed from the temple resources that thus provided an *imprimatur*. This was the only way to safeguard the proper distribution of precise copies of Scripture. These scrolls must have been used everywhere in Israel, for public reading as well as for instruction, public and private. All these texts form a first circle of transmission of the proto-Masoretic text.³⁸

The Qumran texts belonging to the second circle resemble the nature of the “corrected copies” with regard to their closeness to the medieval MT, but they were less precise. Possibly they were copied from the “corrected copies.”

It is not impossible that an effort was made to limit the range of differences between early texts. There is some evidence for this assumption in a Talmudic tradition on the limiting of the differences between three specific texts by comparing their readings in each individual instance of disagreement. Some scholars suggested that several corrections in the Qumran scrolls evidence such a procedure as well, but I have not been convinced.³⁹

3 Renewed Understanding of the Development of MT

The evidence from the Judean Desert allows us not only to comprehend the textual situation at the time of the copying of these scrolls, but also to improve our understanding of the development of MT and to postulate a stage before the earliest available manuscript evidence. The different attestations of the consonantal text of MT point to three main stages that reflect a growing measure of

36 For an initial analysis of the *sefer muggah*, see L. Blau, *Studien zum althebräischen Buchwesen und zur biblischen Literatur- und Textgeschichte* (Strasbourg i. E.: Adolf Alkalay, 1902), 97–111; Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie*, III.170–171.

37 See Tov, *ibid.*, 179, n. 44.

38 For a detailed discussion, see *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 171–188.

39 For an analysis, see *Scribal Practices*, 223–225.

internal stabilization and agreement between the members of the group of MT. A different type of manuscript evidence characterizes each stage. The description that follows refers only to the precursors of MT (the proto-Masoretic texts) and MT itself, and must therefore be integrated into the description of the development of the biblical text as a whole. These three stages, recognized on the basis of evidence, were preceded by an additional, hypothetical stage.

3.1

The assumption of the existence of a stage of MT that preceded that of the manuscript evidence is hypothetical. The origins of MT are unclear, but this text or these texts must have existed before the stage for which we have manuscript evidence. At Qumran we have such evidence for the MT-like texts from 250 BCE onwards. For the pure MT texts—the first circle—we have evidence from 50 BCE onwards from the other Judean Desert sites. We named the Qumran manifestations of MT the second circle.

On the basis of its orthography, the present form of MT has been dated by different scholars to the periods between 550 and 350 BCE, 400 and 100 BCE and also to the end of the third century or the beginning of the second century BCE. Some of these dates are early, and precede the stage of the available evidence. Biblical manuscripts existed before the earliest text evidence of MT, but we do not know when MT itself was created, so to speak. Scholars presuppose stages of books that preceded MT, as in the case of Jeremiah, but we would like to know *when* MT was created. We cannot think of any sound criteria for establishing the date of MT based on its contents and obviously such a date would differ from book to book. The Masoretic edition of Jeremiah is post-exilic, as opposed to the edition included in the LXX, but we would like to be more specific.

At this first hypothetical stage, MT already must have been a good text, although not written with the same precision as that displayed in later periods, and it was probably extant in the Temple Court. The orthography was inconsistent and at least Samuel contained relatively many mistakes and was marred by theological tendencies. Although there is no manuscript evidence pertaining to the internal differences within the MT group in the first period, it would appear from a comparison of parallel texts within MT itself that such differences already existed between the various textual witnesses at an early stage. We should remember that the character of MT cannot be characterized.

3.2

The *second* stage of the textual transmission extends over a long time-span. Its beginning and end are determined by the availability of sources in the Judean Desert, starting with 250 BCE (the earliest Qumran evidence) and ending with

135 CE (the texts found at Wadi Murabbaʿat, Wadi Sdeir, Naḥal Ḥever, Naḥal Arugot, and Naḥal Şeʿelim written before the Bar-Kochba revolt). The earliest evidence from Qumran records the second circle and the scrolls from the other sites reflect the first circle of transmission. The destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE, occurring in the middle of this period, did not change the textual situation in Palestine, and the appearance of a seemingly larger number of MT texts after that date is a mere optical illusion.⁴⁰ The earliest textual evidence of MT displays a rather uniform picture.

The witnesses for this stage may be divided into two groups of texts, defined in accordance with their closeness to the medieval tradition of MT. For this purpose, the texts are compared with the medieval codex L as the best complete representative of the medieval text. We distinguish in this period between an inner circle of Hebrew proto-rabbinic scrolls (Judean Desert texts from sites other than Qumran) and ancient translations that agree precisely with the medieval codex L and a second circle of scrolls (the Qumran scrolls) that are very similar to it. The latter group is the earlier, according to the preserved evidence, but typologically it reflects a later stage.

Some translations that reflect the medieval text of MT also derive from this period: some of the Targumim and the Peshitta, both originating during either the second or third stage of the development of MT, as well as two revisions (recensions) of the LXX, *kaige*-Th probably dating to the middle of the first century BCE and Aquila probably dating to 125 CE. All these sources, with the possible exception of the Peshitta, are identical to the medieval text of MT to the same extent as the proto-Masoretic scrolls from the Judean Desert discussed above. All translations that originated from the first century CE onwards are bound to reflect the text that was to become the medieval MT since there simply were no other Hebrew Jewish texts to be translated. Besides, the Targumim were the in-house texts of the rabbis and therefore by definition they were based on MT.

3.3

The *third* stage of transmission, characterized by a relatively high degree of textual consistency (except for the Severus Scroll, whose text frequently differs from MT), extends from the Bar-Kochba revolt (132–135 CE) until the eighth century CE. Most of the witnesses for this period pertain to its latter end,

⁴⁰ Since there was no group in Judaism that embraced texts other than MT, the impression is created that MT slowly was accepted by all streams in Judaism or, in other words, that the biblical text was stabilized.

namely the earliest texts from the Cairo Genizah. In the 1890s, more than 200,000 fragments of manuscripts, among them tens of thousands of biblical fragments, dating from the ninth century onward, were found in the Cairo Genizah, the genizah of the synagogue of Fuṣṭat, "Old Cairo." All these texts reflect MT.

Also the translations prepared in this period reflect the medieval text of MT: the Targumim and the Peshitta, both originating during either the second or third stage of MT, Symmachus, the fifth column of the Hexapla, and the Vulgate. We do not know when the Peshitta and the Targumim originated, so that I mention them for both the second and the third period. Also, the great majority of the biblical quotations in rabbinic literature and the *piyyuṭim* (liturgical hymns)⁴¹ agree with MT.

3-4

The *fourth* stage of transmission, characterized by almost complete textual unity, extends from the eighth century until the end of the Middle Ages. The main sources for this period are Masoretic manuscripts containing the complete apparatus of the Masorah and biblical quotations in the writings of the traditional Jewish commentators.⁴² The earliest dated Masoretic manuscripts are from the ninth century.⁴³ During this period, MT became almost completely standardized, due largely to the addition of the apparatuses of vocalization, accentuation, and Masorah necessitating the fixation of the consonants that formed their base.

4 A Single Text at the Base of the Masoretic Tradition?

By necessity, the previous analysis leads to the question of whether or not all manuscripts of MT go back to a single source. We believe such a source, or possibly a series of sources, once existed. It is difficult to know whether a single early source (an "original") of MT ever existed in the fifth, fourth, or third

41 Cf. M. Wallenstein, "The Piyyut, with Special Reference to the Textual Study of the Old Testament," *BJRL* 34 (1952): 469–476.

42 See, for example, S. Esh, "Variant Readings in Mediaeval Hebrew Commentaries; R. Samuel Ben Meir (Rashbam)," *Textus* 5 (1966): 84–92. Many examples are provided by E.L. Greenstein, "Misquotation of Scripture in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume* (ed. B. Walfish; Haifa: Haifa University Press, 1993), 71–83 (71–73).

43 According to S.A. Birnbaum, "A Sheet of an Eighth Century Synagogue Scroll," *VT* 9 (1959): 122–129, a manuscript found at Jews College, London, was written somewhat earlier.

centuries BCE, and even if such a text had existed, it cannot be identified or reconstructed. Furthermore, if such a text had once existed, it was changed subsequently, although we do not know how much it was changed.

Referring to the medieval manuscripts of MT, de Lagarde surmised that all of them attest to a single archetype in antiquity because all the copies of MT reflect its distinctive scribal features, such as the *puncta extraordinaria* as well as very distinct common errors, such as those, for example, in the somewhat corrupt text of Samuel. That early copy may well have been the scroll in the Temple Court (see above), which was preceded by presumed earlier copies of very similar content.

We accept the postulate of de Lagarde for reasons in addition to those given by him: We base ourselves on the aforementioned identity of the medieval manuscripts of MT and the Judean Desert texts except for the Qumran scrolls, which lead us to believe that a single text existed in the last centuries BCE that may be named the archetype of MT. That text was transmitted in Judaism from that period until the Middle Ages (the present text of MT) and remained unchanged over the centuries. The assumption of this early archetype involves a speculative position, based on partial evidence, on which few scholars have expressed a view, and therefore it is hard to say whether this position reflects the majority or a minority view.

The one copy postulated as the original text of MT from which all medieval texts and the Judean Desert evidence derive can be traced back in some cases as early as the beginning of the third century BCE. However, we do not know how far it can be traced back to earlier periods.

In my reconstruction of the evidence, we thus make far-reaching conclusions that ultimately go back to our explanation of the Judean Desert evidence from Qumran and the other sites.

The Background of the Stichometric Arrangements of Poetry in the Judean Desert Scrolls

While most of the poetry texts in MT are written as running texts, the medieval manuscripts present the תנ"ך books (Job, Proverbs, and Psalms), some songs of the Torah, the song of Deborah, and the acrostic in Lamentations broken into poetic lines.¹

These traditions, along with other systems of laying out poetical segments were reflected already in some texts from the Judean Desert, but other ancient texts containing poetical segments were written as running texts. The practice of a stichographic² representation was developed for the books written in a system of strict *parallelismus membrorum*, which therefore could easily be represented stichographically. This practice was also used for most songs in the Torah. Other poetical books, such as the Major Prophets, likewise reflect such *parallelismus*, but not in all chapters, and possibly for this reason no stichographic writing tradition was developed for them. As a result, most poetical books are not represented in stichographic writing.

The stichographic arrangements of poetical texts reflect their scribes' understanding of the poetical structure, although it is unclear to what extent these layouts reflect the original intention of the poets behind the texts.

The external facts regarding the layouts of the Judean Desert texts have been described in the past, especially in my own writing.³ It is the purpose of the present short study to clarify their background and to link the differences between these arrangements with the contents of the scrolls. In other words, we wish to clarify why certain poetical texts were written in a special layout while others were not. For this purpose, we must first describe the basic facts.

1 The layouts of the poems in the medieval manuscripts and printed editions, as well as their relationship to statements in rabbinic literature, were analyzed in detail by M. Breuer, *The Aleppo Codex and the Accepted Text of the Bible* (Heb. with Eng. summ.; Jerusalem: Mosad ha-Rav Kook, 1976), 149–189.

2 The term is used in the discussion by J. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and its History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 119–127.

3 *Scribal Practices*, 166–178.

In the Judean Desert texts a special arrangement of poetical units is known almost exclusively for biblical texts⁴ (including Ben Sira [2QSir and MasSir]).⁵ So far, the only known exception is the nonbiblical 4QMessianic Apocalypse (4Q521) 2 ii written in the most simple stichographic layout (system 1.2 below).⁶

Within Hebrew Scripture, this stichographic layout is evidenced for the Judean Desert texts of two poems in the Torah (Exodus 15; Deuteronomy 32), and of Psalms (especially Psalm 119), Proverbs, Lamentations, and Job. All biblical units for which special stichographic arrangements are preserved among the Qumran texts have also been preserved in Qumran copies that do not display any special arrangement.

Although two scrolls of Exodus, one of Deuteronomy, many Psalms, and copies of Lamentations and Job are written *without* any special arrangement (Table 2), thirty Judean Desert texts containing poetical units are written completely or partially in one of the forms of stichographic writing. In three units (Deuteronomy 32, Psalms, and Proverbs) they have different layouts (Table 1). These layouts are based on aesthetic or exegetical traditions that sometimes differ from those of the Masoretes and the early versions.

Tables 1 and 2 include the dates assigned to the scrolls as a possible clue for understanding the differentiation between scrolls written in a special layout and those not written in such a layout (see the discussion below).⁷ We suggest that the clue for understanding the two types of layout is the textual character of the texts, and therefore references to textual characterizations,⁸ subjective

4 This layout is not employed for any of the nonbiblical poetical compositions from the Judean Desert, such as 4QNon-Canonical Psalms A, B (4Q380, 4Q381), the *Hodayot* from caves 1 (1QH^{a,b}) and 4 (4QH^{a-f}), 4QBarkhi Nafshi^{a-e}, and 4QShirShabb^{a-f}.

5 This arrangement probably implies that Ben Sira was considered to be biblical, not necessarily by the Qumran community, but by the scribes of 2QSir and MasSir. The fact that the song in Exodus 15 in 4QRP^c (4Q365 6a ii and 6c) is written in a special layout may imply that its scribe considered this composition a biblical text.

6 Likewise, the poetical segments in the following early *Greek* biblical texts were written stichographically: P.Fouad 266b (848) of Deuteronomy 32 (middle of 1 BCE); P.Antinoopolis 8 of Proverbs 5–20 (3 CE); P. Chester Beatty XI of Sirach (3 CE). E.J.C. Tigchelaar, “Lady Folly and her House in Three Qumran Manuscripts: On the Relation between 4Q525 15, 5Q16, and 4Q184 1,” *RevQ* 23 (2008): 271–281 (273) recognizes such a system also in the fragmentary text of 5Q16 1–2, 5.

7 The data are culled from the summary list by B. Webster, “Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert,” in *DJD* XXXIX, 351–446.

8 MT, SP, LXX, (indep)endent, QSP = Qumran Scribal Practice (as summarized in Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 261–273). The nature of the independent (non-aligned) texts is explained in my *TCHB*, 109–110.

TABLE 1 *Manuscripts of poetical units displaying a stichographic layout*

Manuscript	Content	Date	Char.	Syst
4QRP ^c (4Q365) 6b 1–4	Exodus 15, including the verse after the Song, Exod 15:19, and also a poetical unit not contained in the biblical text, probably representing the Song of Miriam	40–10 BCE	indep.	3
1QDeut ^b	Deuteronomy 32; the other chapters are in prose	no date	MT/SP	2.2
4QDeut ^b	Deuteronomy 32; the other chapters were in prose	150–100 BCE	indep.	1.2
4QDeut ^c	reconstructed layout; only in Deuteronomy 32	150–100 BCE	indep.	1.1
4QDeut ^q	Deuteronomy 32; this scroll probably contained only that poem	50 BCE–10 CE	LXX	1.1
4QpaleoDeut ^r	Deuteronomy 32; the other chapters are in prose	100–25 BCE	MT/SP	2.1
1QPs ^a	only Psalm 119; the other Psalms are in prose	no date	unclear	2.1
4QPs ^b	Psalms 91–118	30–68 CE	indep.	1.1 and 1.2
4QPs ^c	Psalms 16–53	50–68 CE	MT	2.1
4QPs ^d from III 13 onwards	Psalm 104; the earlier columns are in prose	100–30 BCE	indep.	1.1
4QPs ^g	Psalm 119; no other Psalms preserved	c. 50 CE	MT	1.2
4QPs ^h	Psalm 119; no other Psalms preserved	30 BCE–70 CE	unclear	1.2
4QPs ⁱ	only Psalm 104; no other Psalms preserved	50–1 BCE	indep.?	1.1
4QPs ^w	Psalm 112; no other Psalms preserved	125–75 BCE	unclear	2.2
5QPs	Psalm 119; no other Psalms preserved	1–100 CE	unclear	2.1
8QPs	Psalms 17–18; no other Psalms preserved	1–100 CE	unclear	2.1

TABLE 1 *Manuscripts of poetical units displaying a stichographic layout (cont.)*

Manuscript	Content	Date	Char.	Syst
11QPs ^a	Psalm 119; the other Psalms are in prose	1–50 CE	indep. and QSP	1.2
11QPs ^b	Psalm 119; the other Psalms are in prose	30–1 BCE	indep. and QSP	2.1
5/6HevPs	Psalms 7–16, 18, 22–25, 29–31	50–68 CE	MT	2.1
MasPs ^a	Psalms 81–85	30–1 BCE	MT	2.1
MasPs ^b	Psalm 147	50–25 BCE	MT	3
4QJob ^a	chapters 31–37	100–50 BCE	MT?	1.2
4QpaleoJob ^c	probably; chapters 13, 14	225–150 BCE	MT?	1.2
4QProv ^a	chapters 1–2	50 BCE–30 CE	MT	2.1
4QProv ^b	chapters 9, 13–15	30 BCE–50 CE	MT	3
3QLam	ch. 3	30 BCE–68 CE	unclear	2.1
5QLam ^b	ch. 4	50 CE	unclear	1.2 or 2.1
2QSir	ch. 6	50–1 BCE		1.2
MasSir	chapters 39–44	10 BCE–50 CE		2.1
4QMessianic		125–75 BCE		1.2
Apocalypse (4Q521) 2 ii				

as they may be, have been added to the list, and also the specific stichographic system employed, as specified below.⁹

Not all the Qumran biblical scrolls were written in stichographic writing in units that were arranged in a special (poetical) layout in other Qumran scrolls. An almost equal amount of scrolls does not display any such arrangement. Table 2 lists twenty-six such texts (nineteen Psalms scrolls and seven other texts) written without any stichographic layout as running texts, while four other texts (1QPs^a, 4QPs^d, 11QPs^a, 11QPs^b) contain both prose and stichographic sections. Eleven Psalms scrolls listed in Table 1 present a full stichographic arrangement.

As in Table 1, the following table includes references to the textual character of the scrolls.

9 These characterizations are culled from Appendix 8 in Tov, *Scribal Practices*.

TABLE 2 *Manuscripts of poetical units not displaying a stichographic layout*

Manuscript	Notes	Date	Char
4QExod ^c	Exodus 15	50–25 BCE	MT
4QExod ^d	Exodus 15	225–175 BCE	indep.
4QDeut ^j XII	Deuteronomy 32; see J.A. Duncan, <i>DJD</i> XIV, 90	50 CE	indep. and QSP
1QPs ^a	all Psalms excluding Psalm 119 which is written in a special layout	no date	unclear
1QPs ^b		no date	unclear
1QPs ^c		no date	unclear
3QPs	only Psalm 2 is preserved	1–100 CE	unclear
4QPs ^a		150 BCE	indep.
4QPs ^d	until col. III 5; the remainder is written in a special layout	100–30 BCE	indep.
4QPs ^e		30–68 CE	indep.
4QPs ^f		50–68 CE	indep.
4QPs ^j		50 CE	unclear
4QPs ^k		100–30 BCE	indep.
4QPs ^m		30–1 BCE	MT?
4QPs ⁿ		30–1 BCE	indep.
4QPs ^o		30–1 BCE	QSP?
4QPs ^p	probably	30 BCE–68 CE	unclear
4QPs ^q		30 BCE–30 CE	indep.
4QPs ^r		30 BCE–68 CE	indep.
4QPs ^s		50–68 CE	unclear
4QPs ^u	probably	50 CE	unclear
6QpapPs?	probably	50 CE	unclear
11QPs ^a	all Psalms excluding Psalm 119 which is written in a special layout	1–50 CE	indep. and QSP
11QPs ^b	all Psalms excluding Psalm 119 which is written in a special layout	30–1 BCE	indep. and QSP
11QPs ^c		1–50 CE	indep. and QSP?
11QPs ^d		30–68 CE	indep. and QSP?
2QJob		30 BCE–68 CE	unclear
4QJob ^b		50–1 BCE	unclear
4QLam		30–1 BCE	indep. and QSP
5QLam ^a		50 CE	unclear

In the texts that are arranged in a special layout, *three main systems* are recognizable in the same biblical texts.¹⁰

1 One or Two Hemistichs (without Spaces between Them) per Line

This pattern is used especially in Deuteronomy 32 and Psalm 119. The spaces at the ends of the lines indicate the ends of the poetical units.

1.1 One Hemistich per Line

- 4QDeut^c (containing several segments of Deuteronomy), probably, in Deuteronomy 32 (reconstructed layout)
- 4QDeut^a (Deuteronomy 32 only). This text contains an unusual combination of lines with single hemistichs (1 1–4, 9–10 and all of col. 11) and of two hemistichs per line (col. 1 5–8, 11); in the latter case, it is unclear whether these hemistichs are separated by spaces. The writing of this text should be considered a variation of system 1.1
- 4QPs^b (1–xxxiii); in cols. xxxiv–xxxv, system 1.2 is used.
- 4QPs^d (from iii 5 onwards: other sections are in prose; parts of Psalm 104; other parts of that Psalm and of Psalms 106 [?] and 147 are in prose)
- 4QPsⁱ (Psalm 104; no other Psalms preserved)

1.2 Two Hemistichs per Line not Separated by Spaces

- 4QDeut^b (Deuteronomy 32; the remainder is in prose)
- 4QPs^b xxxiv–xxxv (in the preceding cols. system 1.1 is used)
- 4QPs^g (Psalm 119; no other Psalms preserved)

¹⁰ For example, Deuteronomy 32 was written once in running form (4QDeutⁱ) as well as in four or five different stichographic systems: one hemistich per line (most of 4QDeut^a and probably also 4QDeut^c), two hemistichs per line without spaces in the middle (4QDeut^b), two stichs per line separated by spaces between the stichs and hemistichs (1QDeut^b), and two hemistichs per line separated by spaces (4QpaleoDeut^r). 4QDeut^a actually presents a fifth system combining lines of single and two hemistichs.

- 4QPs^h (Psalm 119; no other Psalms preserved)
- 11QPs^a (Psalm 119; in a few instances a space separates the two hemistichs [VII 4; VIII 6; XI 7; XII 12]; the other Psalms are in prose)
- 4QJob^a (chapters 31–37)
- 4QpaleoJob^c (probably; chapters 13, 14)
- 5QLam^b (or system 1.2; ch. 4; only the beginnings of the lines have been preserved)

This group contains three copies of the acrostic Psalm 119 in which each line starts with the determining letter of the alphabet.

2 Two Hemistichs or Stichs per Line Separated by Spacing

The separation of stichs or hemistichs by spacing creates a layout which resembles the Masoretic system named a “half-brick (אריח) on top of a half-brick (אריח),” and may well have been the basis for that layout. The graphic arrangement more or less reflects the arrangement of parallel hemistichs and stichs; even when the poetical unit consists of three segments, the same graphic arrangement is presented.

2.1 *Two Hemistichs per Line Separated by a Space*

The width of the space ranges usually from 0.5 to 1.0 cm, but with very long cola the space is minute; in MasPs^a it varies from 0.5 to 2.2 cm.

- 4QpaleoDeut^r (Deuteronomy 32; the other chapters are in prose)
- 1QPs^a (Psalm 119; the other Psalms are in prose)
- 4QPs^c (Psalms 16–53; however, when the lines in the column are too short for the two hemistichs, the second hemistich continues on the next line [col. I 26–29; III 24–25, 26–27])
- 5QPs (Psalm 119; no other Psalms preserved)
- 8QPs (Psalms 17–18; no other Psalms preserved)
- 11QPs^b (Psalm 119; the other Psalms are in prose)
- 5/6HevPs (Psalms 7–16, 18, 22–25, 29–31)
- MasPs^a (Psalms 81–85)
- 4QProv^a (chapters 1–2)
- 3QLam (ch. 3; three poetical units per line?)
- 5QLam^b (only the beginnings of the lines have been preserved; or system 1.2)

- 2QSir (ch. 6; thus the reconstruction in *DJD*. However, possibly this text was written in system 1.2)
- MasSir (chapters 39–44)

In this system of presentation, the first hemistichs started from a straight right margin, usually indicated with a vertical dry line, while the second stichs began at a slightly different point on each line, since the first hemistichs were of a different length.¹¹

If the preserved evidence of the scrolls from the Judean Desert does not mislead us, this system of presentation was the most frequently used when these scrolls were written. It is based on the principle of the *parallelismus membrorum*, with the two parallel stichs written next to each other, separated by a space.¹²

This group contains three copies of the acrostic Psalm 119 in which each line starts with the determining letter of the alphabet.

2.2 *Two Stichs per Line with Spaces between the Stichs and Hemistichs*

- 1QDeut^b (Deuteronomy 32; the other chapters are in prose)

In the following manuscript, no information regarding the spacing is available:

- 4QPs^w (Psalm 112; no other Psalms preserved)

3 *Hemistichs or Clusters of 2–3 Words Separated by Spaces*

Unlike in the first two systems, the spaces occur at different places in the line, in two different patterns.

¹¹ This bi-columnar arrangement is also represented in the Masoretic manuscripts of Deuteronomy 32 (see below) and SP in Exodus 15, the Balaam oracles in Numbers 23 and 24, and Deuteronomy 32.

¹² However, also when three-stich units do not reflect a parallel structure, the three stichs are nevertheless presented in a two-stich system in one-and-a-half lines (thus Ps 81:6, 8, 11 in MasPs^a). One notes that the stichographic arrangement of MasPs^a 11 22–24 (Ps 83:9–11) goes against the meaning of the stichs themselves. See Talmon, *Masada* vi, 85.

- 4QProv^b (chapters 9, 13–15; hemistichs)
- MasPs^b (Psalms 147, 150; hemistichs)
- 4QRP^c (4Q365) 6b 1–4 (Exodus 15, including the verse after the Song, Exod 15:19 and also a poetical unit not contained in the biblical text, probably the Song of Miriam)

4 Analysis

Previously, we stated that it is difficult to ascertain whether there is any pattern behind the different ways of presenting the text of poetical units,¹³ either with or without a stichographic arrangement.¹⁴ We now suggest the following types of explanation for the different layout systems:

Possibility 1: Chronological distinction between the different types of arrangement (see the dates provided in Tables 1 and 2).¹⁵

Possibility 2: The texts that do not reflect a special layout, especially the Psalms scrolls, were not considered Scripture. Rather, they served another purpose, such as that of a liturgical collection.¹⁶

Possibility 3: Conversely, since Psalm 119 is always arranged stichographically and is part of the later Jewish liturgy, it is possible that stichographic writing was reserved for liturgical use.¹⁷

¹³ Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 170.

¹⁴ The problem is most acute in the Psalms scrolls since they are the largest component in the lists in Tables 1 and 2.

¹⁵ The oldest scrolls in Table 1 are older than those in Table 2 (see, however, 4QExod). This observation could lead to the view that at the outset a stichographic arrangement was the rule, and that subsequently this layout was often abandoned.

¹⁶ This suggestion was raised hesitantly by J.M. Oesch, "Textgliederung im Alten Testament und in den Qumranhandschriften," *Henoch* 5 (1983): 289–321 (317), who suggested that the parameters of the graphic presentation of the Qumran texts were determined by the purpose for which the compositions were written. However, this claim cannot be made for all the Psalm scrolls mentioned above. If the prose arrangement of the biblical Psalms in Psalms scrolls together with liturgical additions in some collections (especially 11QPs^a) is an indication of their use in religious gatherings, several such collections are indeed fully or partly arranged stichographically (Table 1), but others are not (Table 2).

¹⁷ Psalms 119 and 104, either when presented separately (4QPs^g, 4QPs^h, 4QPsⁱ [Psalm 104], 5QPs) or together with other Psalms (1QPs^a, 4QPs^d, 11QPs^a, 11QPs^b) are always written stichographically. The same argument may apply to the two poems in the Torah (Exodus

Possibility 4: The choice of the presentation system was determined by the personal preference of scribes.¹⁸

None of these solutions was found to be satisfactory, and we therefore suggest linking the use of a system of stichography with the textual character of the texts. In particular, scribes writing in the proto-Masoretic tradition employed the stichometric system. More in detail:

1. Texts not displaying a stichographic layout, as presented in Table 2, clearly do not belong to the tradition of MT. Only two among the thirty biblical texts in this group do belong to the MT family: 4QExod^c (MT) and 4QPs^m (MT?). The texts included in this group are either “independent,” that is, they are not exclusively close to a specific textual witness (MT, LXX, other sources), or reflect the QSP (Qumran Scribal Practice).
2. Table 1 (poetical texts displaying a stichographic layout) includes a group of texts that are closely linked to MT (twelve texts, two of which are MT/SP), as well as eight independent texts (two of which are both independent and QSP), and one that is close to the LXX. This group thus has a varied textual character, but since this is by far the main system used for MT texts, we suggest that they were transmitted only or mainly stichographically. Among the preserved texts, this system was used especially for texts other than the Psalms for the simple reason that very few MT psalters were found at Qumran. Therefore, we do not know whether the early MT psalters were also written stichographically.¹⁹

The medieval MT scribes did not invent these stichographic arrangements, but employed a system that may have existed at an earlier time. A strong argument

¹⁵; Deuteronomy 32) and Lamentations, but not to Proverbs, Job, and Sirach, which are also presented stichographically.

¹⁸ Since these texts derived from different circles, possibly the various ways of presenting poetical units do not reflect differences between individual scribes, but rather between the scribal traditions within which scribes operated. In any event, at least for Psalm 119 a special layout was used consistently. That acrostic Psalm was written as poetry with two hemistichs per line separated by spaces (1QPs^a, 5QPs, 11QPs^b) or without such spaces (4QPs^g, 4QPs^h, 11QPs^a), and all the lines of a stanza started with the same letter. This pertains also to the acrostics in 3QLam (ch. 3) and 5QLam^b (ch. 4). At the same time, the acrostic Psalm 25 in 5/6XHevPs XII has two letters of the alphabet per line.

¹⁹ We cannot make the opposite observation that MT psalters were written without stichographical arrangement since such a statement is not borne out by the facts.

in favor of the assumption of the connection between the MT scribes and the stichographic arrangements is the fact that the medieval texts of MT further developed them. In light of this, it is important to note that the system that is most frequently used among the MT group of texts from the Judean Desert is system 2.1, which is closest to the layout prescribed in rabbinic texts and is found in most medieval Masoretic poetic texts.²⁰

The connection between the stichographic practices of the ancient scrolls of the Masoretic family and the medieval MT manuscripts is further strengthened by negative evidence. This evidence pertains to the poetical units that are *not* written stichographically in both the ancient scrolls and the medieval manuscripts. In the following list of the poetical units from the Judean Desert that are not written stichographically, our attention is focused especially on the texts of the Masoretic family listed first:

- Genesis 49 as preserved in the fragmentary 4QGen-Exod^a (MT) and 4QGen^e (MT/SP).
- Deuteronomy 33 in 1QDeut^b (MT/SP), 4QDeut^c (ind.), 4QDeut^h (ind.), 4QDeutⁱ (textual character unclear), 4QpaleoDeut^r (MT/SP) and MasDeut (MT). Deuteronomy 32 is arranged stichographically in 1QDeut^b, 4QDeut^c and 4QpaleoDeut^r, but the poem in chapter 33 is not arranged stichographically in either MT or SP.
- The poetical portions of Numbers 23–24 in 4QNum^b (SP/LXX). These sections are not arranged stichographically in MT, but they are in SP.
- The Song of Hannah in 1 Samuel 2 in 4QSam^a (LXX/ind.).
- 2 Samuel 22 in 4QSam^a (LXX/ind.) (22:11, 13, 17–20, 24–28, 30–51 are preserved); MT does have a special arrangement (cf. *Sof.* 12.10).

The agreement between these proto-Masoretic texts and the medieval tradition in the absence of a stichographic arrangement is rather striking, especially when the special arrangement of Deuteronomy 32 is contrasted with the lack of such an arrangement in chapter 33.

20 This stichographic arrangement is based on the fixed layout of inscribed and unscribed elements. Rabbinic literature prescribed the recording in this way for the lists of the kings of Canaan (Josh 12:9–24), the sons of Haman (Esth 9:6–9) as well as three Songs in the prose books of the Bible (Exod 15:1–18, Deuteronomy 32, and Judg 5:2–30), but not the Psalms. For further details and references to rabbinic literature, see *Scribal Practices*, 174–175.

The fact that this system, among other layouts, also features in SP,²¹ shows that the bi-columnar arrangement of system 2a must have been a major system used in antiquity.

It is unclear whether the details of this description suffice in order to prove the assumption that the scribes of MT formed a scribal school. The scribal methods of the proto-Masoretic manuscripts can be characterized by their precision, minimal scribal intervention, and occasional *de luxe* format,²² and the proto-Masoretic scribes developed the stichographic system also known from the medieval MT.

21 Lev 26:3–13, Num 23:7–10, 18–24; 24:3–10, 15–24, and Deuteronomy 32. See also Exodus 15 in a different layout. For details, see *Scribal Practices*, 175–176.

22 See *Scribal Practices*, 125–129.

Israeli Scholarship on the Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert [2011]

1 Beginnings

This survey covers the contributions by Israeli scholars to the scholarly investigation of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek biblical fragments found at Qumran and other sites in the Judean Desert.¹ For this purpose, the term “Bible” includes the traditional books of Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Scriptures, excluding the so-called Apocrypha.

The first scrolls, biblical and nonbiblical, were found in 1947, at a decisive moment in history, the time of the birth of the State of Israel. As Sukenik would assert,² they were part of the “Jewish heritage,” “which at this moment could hardly be compartmentalized from an awareness of contemporary events.”³ Indeed, the scrolls inspired Israelis to delve more deeply into the period they covered. The interests were scholarly and probably also somewhat nationalistic for some,⁴ but this did not distort their scholarly objectivity. On the other hand, Christian terminology and views colored the first two decades of scrolls research on the nonbiblical texts in non-Jewish circles.⁵

- 1 For an earlier and far less detailed study, see my “Israeli Scholarship on the Texts from the Judean Desert,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings* (ed. R.A. Kugler & E. Schuller; SBLEJL 15; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1999), 123–127. See also M. Broshi, “Fifty Years of Dead Sea Scrolls Research in Israel,” *SJ* 8 (1999): 83–90.
- 2 Sukenik’s words are reported by J.C. Trever, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Personal Account* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 125.
- 3 G.W.E. Nickelsburg, “Currents in Qumran Scholarship: The Interplay of Data, Agendas, and Methodology,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty*, 89.
- 4 In the preface to his book *The Message of the Scrolls* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957), 14, Yigael Yadin states: “I cannot avoid the feeling that there is something symbolic in the discovery of the scrolls and their acquisition at the moment of the creation of the State of Israel ... These facts may have influenced my approach to the scrolls.”
- 5 See L.H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia/Jerusalem: Jewish Publication Society: 1994), xxi–xxiv, 16–19.

The first three scrolls to reach the hands of scholars were bought by Sukenik on behalf of the Hebrew University in 1947–1948. Four additional scrolls were purchased in 1954 on behalf of the State of Israel, and were exhibited between 1957 and 1965 at the Hebrew University and thereafter in the Shrine of the Book at the Israel Museum.⁶ Feelings of pride in these scrolls in Israel were mixed for two reasons: (1) from an Israeli and Jewish standpoint the Jewish scrolls had been “hijacked” by gentiles: from the beginning of the research until the mid-1980s Jews (including Israelis) were banned from the official publication team that operated in and from east Jerusalem (part of Jordan until 1967) working on the scrolls’ fragments in the Palestine Archaeological (“Rockefeller”) Museum; (2) in its reflections on the text of Hebrew Scripture, organized religious Judaism, as opposed to individual religious scholars, did not see beyond the manuscripts of MT penned in the Middle Ages. Ancient scrolls of the Bible were disregarded, certainly when they differed from MT, but even when they were identical to its consonantal framework. In a way, the texts of the scrolls from sites other than Qumran (such as Masada) from the first centuries CE could have been used to “prove” the early origin of MT, but organized religious circles have never pursued this, as far as I know. The traditionally transmitted text was assumed to reflect the original text of Hebrew Scripture even before the period of the Judean Desert scrolls, although it included the vowels and accents attached to it only in the 9th–10th centuries CE. Jewish tradition perceived these later layers of exegesis as having divine origin, just like the consonantal text.

The young Jewish state was proud to possess some samples of ancient Hebrew scrolls. This was so despite Israeli scholars’ frustration at not being able to participate in the publishing efforts of the bulk of the scrolls as part of the international team, and despite religious Judaism turning its back on them.

Generalizing, I would say that Israeli scrolls scholarship is sober, objective, and text-based, as opposed to tending to theologize. Israeli scholars have written important studies on individual scrolls, on philological, linguistic and exegetical aspects, and on textual theory in general. It remains an open question whether the ability of Israelis, or Jews in general, to read the script of the Scrolls has facilitated or encouraged more scholarly involvement than by gentiles. However, not all the scrolls can be read with the same ease as the great *Isaiah Scroll* (1QIsa^a), and while at the student level skills vary, at the scholarly level Jewish and non-Jewish specialists hardly differ.

6 I am grateful to Adolfo Roitman, Director of the Shrine of the Book, for providing me with the exact dates.

Israeli archaeologists played no part in the excavations in the 1940s and 1950s at Qumran and its surroundings, but in later years they found numerous biblical fragments at Masada and Naḥal Ḥever. These excavations broadened the involvement of the local scholarly community. However, Israeli excavations at Qumran and other sites in the 1990s and early 2000s did not yield any biblical material.

Since 1948 a relatively large number of studies have been published in Hebrew (for details see notes 7 and 8). Such studies written between 1948 and 1964 are covered by Yizhar's bibliography.⁷ Subsequent Hebrew scholarship is covered by the bibliography of García Martínez and Parry⁸ and the ongoing bibliographical surveys by the Orion Center in the *Revue de Qumran* and in the website of that center (since 1995).⁹

2 Critical Editions of the Scrolls

One of the claims to fame of Israeli scholarship is the role played by Eleazar Lipa Sukenik (1889–1953)¹⁰ and his son Yigael Yadin (1917–1984). Sukenik, who was the first to recognize the ancient character and importance of the scrolls, produced the first pioneering editions and also wrote some initial studies. At amazing speed, never matched by any subsequent editions, he published a "First Survey" of the known scrolls in September 1948, certainly a great achievement in the pre-computer era and during the siege of Jerusalem in the War of Independence. The first publication¹¹ contained a comparison of these scrolls with the script of the Nash Papyrus and the Uziahu inscription, and it further presented selections from the scrolls from cave 1. The "Second Survey," published in 1950, improved on the first.¹² His facsimile edition of the photographs of the major texts from cave 1 from 1954 contains an improved version

7 M. Yizhar, *Bibliography of Hebrew Publications on the Dead Sea Scrolls 1948–1964* (HTS 23; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1967).

8 F. García Martínez and D.W. Parry, *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1970–95* (STDJ 19; Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1996).

9 <http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il/>.

10 See N.A. Silberman, "Sukenik," in *Encyclopedia DSS*, 2:902–903.

11 *Megillot Genuzot: Scrolls that Were Stored Away from an Ancient Genizah Found in the Judean Desert, First Survey* (Heb.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1948).

12 *Megillot Genuzot: Scrolls that Were Stored Away from an Ancient Genizah Found in the Judean Desert, Second Survey* (Heb.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1950).

of that survey, with additional transcriptions of texts and more introductory analyses.¹³ These books are now collectors' items. Especially valuable are the photographs, which include the only published photographs to date of the *War Scroll* (1QMilḥamah), and those of 1QHodayot and 1QIsa^b, fully published only in 2009 and 2010.¹⁴ Neither the plates nor the transcriptions in Sukenik's editions are high quality, but they are usable and their condition has not prevented scholarship on these texts from flourishing. The system of text transcription to be used later in the series *Discoveries in the Judean Desert* (*DJD*) had not yet been developed, and these editions are greatly substandard by comparison. The system for presenting the text lacks many details and is quite crude; apparatuses such as notes on readings and comparisons with other texts are non-existent.

It was Sukenik who first called these scrolls *megillot genuzot*, a term still commonly used in Israel today.¹⁵ For many this is the official name of the scrolls, in reference to scrolls placed in a *genizah* upon falling into disuse because of physical damage or when an unacceptable number of mistakes has been recognized. Sukenik suggested this term in 1948 and justified it with arguments like some scrolls such as 1QIsa^b were torn, or 1QIsa^a had been handled so much that the last sheet needed re-inking.¹⁶ However, most scholars have long abandoned this term, and with it the understanding that the caves were ancient *genizot*. Still, it lingers on in the perception of the Israeli public, even if the implications of this nomenclature are not generally recognized.

Because Israeli scholars were at first banned from the publication effort, full text editions of biblical scrolls by Israelis were published at a relatively late stage. The first edition, still substandard, was that by B. Lifshitz of some fragments of the Greek *Minor Prophets Scroll* found in Naḥal Ḥever (1962).¹⁷ Subsequent publications were the developed text editions (with commentaries) by

13 E.L. Sukenik, *Otzar ham-megillot hag-genuzot shebiydey ha-universitah ha-ivrit* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute and the Hebrew University, 1954), brought to completion by Nachman Avigad.

14 Improved photographs of 1QIsa^b are included in *DJD* XXXII, and of 1QH^a in *DJD* XL.

15 See the names of the publications quoted in notes 11–12. See also Sukenik's diary as published by Y. Yadin, "A Biography of E.L. Sukenik," *ErIsr* 8 (1967): 60–85 (Heb.).

16 Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot* (1948), 20–21.

17 This scroll, at first designated as deriving from Wadi Seiyal in Jordanian territory, was subsequently identified as deriving from Naḥal Ḥever since little scraps of it were found there in the "Cave of Horror." These fragments were published by B. Lifshitz, "The Greek Documents from the Cave of Horror," *IEJ* 12 (1962): 201–207.

Y. Yadin, of the *tefillin*¹⁸ and fragments of the large *Psalms Scroll* from Qumran cave 11;¹⁹ by Tov, of the Greek *Minor Prophets Scroll* from Naḥal Ḥever (8HevXIIgr),²⁰ as well as Hebrew fragments of Leviticus, Joshua, Jeremiah, and Canticles, all published in *DJD*;²¹ by Talmon, of the Masada texts;²² by Morgenstern–Segal, of a phylactery;²³ by Morgenstern, of 34SeNum;²⁴ miscellaneous fragments by Baruchi;²⁵ and hitherto unknown fragments by E. and H. Eshel.²⁶ E. Tov was editor-in-chief of the international Qumran publication project (1990–2009) which produced the *Discoveries in the Judean Desert (DJD)* series. The introductory volume to that series provides the necessary information on all the scrolls, including the biblical scrolls.²⁷

3 Integration of the Biblical Scrolls in Philological Commentaries and Scripture Editions

The philological approach to Hebrew Scripture involves a meticulous review of all the details in the ancient witnesses to detect in them ancient readings (variants) differing from MT. These variants are compared with parallel readings in MT, and are often preferred. This procedure was practiced long before the discovery of the scrolls, for example, a comparison of details in the LXX with those in MT. When the scrolls were discovered their details were compared with both

18 Y. Yadin, *Tefillin from Qumran (x Q Phyl 1–4)* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 1969) = *ErIsr* 9 (1969): 60–85 (Heb.).

19 Y. Yadin, “Another Fragment (E) of the Psalms Scroll from Qumran Cave 11,” *Textus* 5 (1966): 1–10.

20 Tov, *DJD* VIII.

21 E. Tov, “4QLev^{c, d, e},” in *DJD* XII, 189–204; “4QJosh^b,” in *DJD* XIV, 151–158; “4QJer^{a, c, d, e},” in *DJD* XV, 145–205; “4QCant^{a–c},” in I XVI, 195–219.

22 S. Talmon, *Masada* VI, 1–149.

23 M. Morgenstern and M. Segal, “XHev/SePhylactery” in *DJD* XXXVIII, 183–191.

24 M. Morgenstern in *DJD* XXXVIII, 209.

25 Y. Baruchi, “Fragmentary Biblical Scrolls from Bar Kochba Revolt Refuge Caves,” *Meghillot* 3 (2005): 177–190 (Heb.).

26 Hanan Eshel, “A Second Fragment of XJudges,” *JJS* 54 (2003): 139–141; E. and H. Eshel, “New Fragments from Qumran: 4QGen^f, 4QIsa^b, 4Q226, 8QGen, and XQpapEnoch,” *DSD* 12 (2005): 134–157; H. Eshel, Y. Baruchi, and R. Porat, “Fragments of a Leviticus Scroll (ArugLev) Found in the Judean Desert in 2004,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 55–60.

27 E. Tov, *DJD* XXXIX and chapter 20 in this volume. See further idem, “Some Academic Memoirs,” in N. David & Armin Lange, eds., *Qumran and the Bible: Studying the Jewish and Christian Scriptures in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (CBET 57; Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 1–28.

these, and with all other sources. The first scroll that became known, the great *Isaiah Scroll* (1QIsa^a), was submitted to such analysis, and usually was found inferior to MT. The first Israeli scholar systematically to compare any scroll with MT in such a philological analysis was probably Moshe Segal, who in his Hebrew commentary to Samuel (1956) provided the content of the Qumran fragments of 1QSam and parts of 4QSam^a and 4QSam^b, which had been published a few years earlier.²⁸ At that early stage in the research Segal lacked the tools to integrate these data into the textual analysis provided in his commentary. His only remark on these scrolls was that the Qumran and the LXX versions of Samuel were either not known to the sages “who issued the official version” of the book (MT), or were rejected by them.²⁹

In later years, when more material was available and the approach to the scrolls became more sophisticated, individual readings from them were quoted in the few critical commentaries that were published in Hebrew; in the case of the only existing Hebrew critical series, the complete text of several fragments was included in the introductions to the commentaries, and their readings were often incorporated into the commentary itself.³⁰

Readings from the scrolls are incorporated into the critical Scripture editions,³¹ very extensively in the *Hebrew University Bible (HUB)*, as stated in its sample edition.³² This coverage was described as “practically complete,”³³ encompassing not only the Isaiah scrolls from cave 1, but also the *pesharim* and quotations in nonbiblical compositions, excluding most of the cave 4 scrolls.

28 M.Z. Segal, *Sifre Shemu'el* (Heb.; Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1956), 48–52, and ב' (Heb.).

29 M.Z. Segal, *Sifre Shemu'el*, 52.

30 See the prefaces and commentaries of the individual volumes of the Hebrew *Mikra leYisra'el* series edited by S. Ahituv and M. Greenberg: S. Ahituv, *Joshua, Introduction and Commentary* (Tel Aviv/Jerusalem: Am Oved/Magnes, 1995), 29–35 (text of 4QJosh^{a,b} and 4QpaleoParaJoshua) and *passim*; S. Bar-Efrat, *ISamuel, Introduction and Commentary* (Tel Aviv/Jerusalem: Am Oved/Magnes, 1996), 17–18 (lists of the fragments without the readings themselves) and *passim*; Y. Hoffman, *Jeremiah, Introduction and Commentary* (Tel Aviv/Jerusalem: Am Oved/Magnes, 2001), 1:4–8 (lists of the fragments without the readings themselves) and *passim*; R. Kasher, *Ezekiel, Introduction and Commentary* (Tel Aviv/Jerusalem: Am Oved/Magnes, 2004), 1:30–35 (including the text of all the known fragments of Ezekiel from Qumran) and *passim*.

31 See my analysis “Recording the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Text Editions of Hebrew Scripture,” in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 221–227.

32 Goshen-Gottstein, *Sample Edition*.

33 Goshen-Gottstein, *Sample Edition*, 33. According to Goshen-Gottstein, the *Sample Edition* (covering Isaiah 2, 5, 11, 51) represented the first complete collation of the Scrolls, being more complete than the third edition of the *Biblia Hebraica*.

The coverage of the scrolls is more comprehensive and improves with each subsequent edition of the *HUB*.³⁴ As soon as text editions or photographs of the scrolls were published they were included in these editions. Thus, coverage of the scrolls is exhaustive in the *HUB* editions of Jeremiah and Ezekiel,³⁵ but not in the earlier edition of Isaiah (see above).³⁶ Following the description in the introduction to each volume,³⁷ all the details of the manuscripts are presented, including all scribal and most orthographic features; however, “reflections of a completely different orthographical and morphological system,” as in the case of 2QJer (spellings such as כִּיָּא and כִּוָּה and forms such as הוֹאָה), are not recorded.³⁸

Differences in the indication of sense units (open/closed sections) between the scrolls and MT are recorded in the second apparatus of the *HUB*, such as the addition of a section break in 4QJer^a after Jer 7:29. On the other hand, differences in the length of these intervals (open/closed sections) are not denoted in Isaiah and Jeremiah, while in Ezekiel they appear in great detail (xl ix–l xi).

Agreements between the scrolls and readings in the LXX as against MT are recorded in the *Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies* (*CATSS*) database,³⁹ accessible through the *Accordance*, *Logos*, and *BibleWorks* programs. The *CATSS* project is co-directed by two scholars: an Israeli, E. Tov, and an American, R.A. Kraft.

4 Use of the Scrolls in Textual Criticism

The most natural area for extensive use of the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls is textual criticism, a discipline extensively developed in Israel. Initial textual work by I.L. Seeligmann laid the foundations for this method.⁴⁰ In one case he dealt

34 Goshen-Gottstein, *HUB, Isaiah*; Rabin–Talmon–Tov, *HUB, Jeremiah*; Goshen-Gottstein–Talmon, *HUB, Ezekiel*.

35 See Rabin–Talmon–Tov, *HUB, Jeremiah*, xxviii; Goshen-Gottstein–Talmon, *HUB, Ezekiel*, xxix.

36 Goshen-Gottstein, *HUB, Isaiah*, “Introduction,” § 57 (xxxvii). D.W. Parry and E. Qimron, *The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a): A New Edition* (STDJ 32; Leiden–Boston–Köln: Brill, 1999) was not yet available at that time.

37 See the volumes of the *HUB, Isaiah*, xxxvi; *Jeremiah*, xxix; *Ezekiel*, xxviii.

38 See Rabin–Talmon–Tov, *HUB, Jeremiah*, “Introduction,” n. 75: “1QIsa^a and 4QIsa^c were treated similarly in the Isaiah volume.”

39 Directed by Robert A. Kraft and Emanuel Tov (Philadelphia–Jerusalem).

40 I.L. Seeligmann, “Indications of Editorial Alteration and Adaptation in the Massoretic Text

extensively with a variant in 1QIsa^{a,b} and the LXX, describing it as sectarian, while ultimately preferring the reading of MT.⁴¹ However, the scholar who first developed an overall textual approach to the scrolls was S. Talmon, in a long series of studies. He used all the available scrolls, and recognized in them textual as well as exegetical⁴² patterns. More than other scholars before him, Talmon developed the understanding that textual and exegetical developments go hand in hand, establishing the basis for this kind of approach with theoretical arguments and manifold examples.⁴³ Earlier Talmon had initiated the view that in the course of the creation and transmission of Hebrew Scripture synonymous words were interchangeable at all levels by authors and scribes, and that such words also appear as variant readings in different manuscripts of the same text, the Qumran scrolls included.⁴⁴ Talmon also developed this understanding for other types of textual variation: identical features and variations occurred in *all* the textual sources, MT (parallel books in MT, *Ketiv/Qere* readings), all the Judean Desert texts, and the ancient versions. The same feature may occur in different sources, so that the direction of the interchange is usually irrelevant (for example, the interchange between MT בית and a parallel word בני in another source appears alongside the reverse feature of בני in MT and בית in other sources, for example, in the phrase בני ישראל).⁴⁵ Likewise, the interchange between ידע in MT of Isa 47:8 and ראה in 1QIsa^a is paralleled by similar and reverse changes in other sources.⁴⁶

and the Septuagint," *VT* 11 (1961): 201–321 (Hebrew trans. in *Studies in Biblical Literature*, edited by A. Hurvitz et al.; 2nd rev. ed.; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1996), 319–326.

41 "ΔΕΙΞΑΙ ΑΥΤΩΙ ΦΩΣ," *Tarbiz* 27 (1958): 127–141 (Heb. with Eng. summ.) (= *Studies in Biblical Literature*, 411–426).

42 S. Talmon, "DSIa as a Witness to Ancient Exegesis of the Book of Isaiah," *ASTI* 1 (1962): 62–72 (= idem, *The World of Qumran from Within* [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1989], 131–141 and in Cross–Talmon, *QHBT*, 116–126); "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of the Qumran Manuscripts," *Textus* 4 (1964): 95–132 (= Cross–Talmon, *QHBT*, 226–263).

43 See especially S. Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible: A New Outlook," in Cross–Talmon, *QHBT*, 321–400.

44 S. Talmon, *Conflate Readings: A Basic Phenomenon in the Transmission of the Old Testament Text*, (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1956); "Double Readings in the Massoretic Text," *Textus* 1 (1960): 144–184; "Synonymous Readings in the Textual Traditions of the Old Testament," *ScrHier* 8 (1961): 335–383. These and other studies were included in S. Talmon, *Text and Canon of the Hebrew Bible: Collected Studies* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010).

45 Talmon, "Synonymous Readings," 346–348.

46 Talmon, "Synonymous Readings," 341–342.

Additional studies on individual Qumran texts and passages were published by other Israeli scholars: relatively early studies by R. Weiss on the scrolls, often in relation to SP,⁴⁷ as well as on the *Targum of Job* from cave 11,⁴⁸ illustrate the breadth of the textual variation in these sources, more especially its linguistic background; E. Eshel wrote the first detailed study of the harmonizing texts in the Torah⁴⁹ as well as a general introduction to the biblical scrolls.⁵⁰ D. Nakman wrote an extensive study of the variants in the *tefillin*.⁵¹ E. Tov and F. Polak⁵² devoted detailed studies to the status of 4QSam^a vis-à-vis the LXX, and L. Gottlieb showed how a scribal feature is elucidated by an analysis of several scroll passages.⁵³

A. Rofé (1932–) paid much attention to theologically motivated readings in the scrolls and elsewhere,⁵⁴ especially readings influenced by religious thought

47 These studies were posthumously assembled in *Mishut ba-miqra', Sugiyot miqra'iyot, ha-miqra' be-Qumran. ha-ḥumash hashomroni* (Jerusalem: Rubinstein, [1976]). This collection contains the following studies: "The Bible of the Qumran Sect" (221–237), "The Biblical Scrolls from the Judean Desert and the Masoretic Text" (238–277), "The Evidence of the Biblical Text in the Pesharim and other Sectarian Writings among the Qumran Scrolls" (277–300); "Psalm 91 from Qumran" (301–303).

48 R. Weiss, *The Aramaic Targum of Job* (Heb.; Tel Aviv: The Chaim Rosenberg School for Jewish Studies, Tel Aviv University, 1979).

49 E. Eshel, *'arikah harmonistit be-ḥamisha ḥumshe torah bitequphat bayit sheni* (unpubl. M.A. thesis, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1990); eadem, "4QDeutⁿ and 4QLev^d: A Possible Source for the Temple Scroll and Miqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah," *DSd* 2 (1995): 1–13.

50 E. Eshel, "The Bible in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in A. Berlin and M.Z. Brettler, eds., *The Jewish Study Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 1920–1928.

51 D. Nakman, "The Contents and Order of the Biblical Sections in the *Tefillin* from Qumran and Rabbinic Halakhah: Similarity, Difference, and Some Historical Conclusions," *Cathedra* 112 (2004): 19–44 (Heb.).

52 E. Tov, "The Textual Affiliations of 4QSam^a," *JSOT* 14 (1979): 37–53; repr. in *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel, 1980 Proceedings IOSCS, Vienna* (edition. E. Tov; Jerusalem: Academic, 1980), 189–205; rev. ed. in Tov, *Greek-Hebrew Bible*, 273–283; F.H. Polak, "Statistics and Textual Filiation: The Case of 4QSam^a/LXX (with a Note on the Text of the Pentateuch)," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings* (Manchester, 1990) (ed. G.J. Brooke & B. Lindars; SCS 33; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992), 215–276.

53 L. Gottlieb, "Repetition Due to Homoeoteleuton," *Textus* 21 (2002): 21–44.

54 A. Rofé, "The Piety of the Torah-Disciples at the Winding-up of the Hebrew Bible: Josh. 1:8; Ps. 1:2; Isa. 59:21," in H. Merklein, K. Müller and G. Stemberger, eds., *Bibel in jüdischer und christlicher Tradition—Festschrift Johann Maier* (Frankfurt a.M.: Anton Hain, 1993), 78–85; "The Israelite Religion and the Qumran Texts," in *On a Scroll of a Book: Articles on*

(nomistic readings).⁵⁵ His special contribution to the study of the biblical scrolls is his attempt to understand the theological background of these readings, while aware that such tendencies may occur in any source, including MT. These readings are indicative of the development of ideas in ancient Israel, sometimes pointing to differences between streams in Judaism.⁵⁶ Likewise, M. Segal illustrated the theological aspects of the transmission in 1Samuel.⁵⁷

In line with the approach of S. Talmon, Tov continued to integrate the study of the biblical Dead Sea scrolls into the praxis of textual criticism, into general descriptions,⁵⁸ into his handbook on the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible,⁵⁹ and into additional studies. Tov claimed that in their biblical exegesis, most scholars focused too much on MT, even those who were well aware of

The Dead Sea Scrolls: Lectures from Meetings on The Dead Sea Scrolls, The Hebrew University in Jerusalem, The Institute of Jewish Studies, November–December 1995 (ed. L. Mazor; Heb.; Jerusalem: Mount Scopus Publications, Magnes, 1997), 66–72; “The Acts of Nahash according to 4QSam^a,” *IEJ* 32 (1982): 129–133; “4QMidrash Samuel? Observations Concerning the Character of 4QSam^a,” *Textus* 19 (1998): 63–74; “Historico-Literary Aspects of the Qumran Biblical Scrolls,” in Schiffman, *DSS*, 30–39; “Phases in the Creation of Biblical Books in the Light of Qumran Biblical Scrolls,” in G. Brin and B. Nitzan, eds., *Fifty Years of Dead Sea Scrolls Research: Studies in Memory of Jacob Licht* (Jerusalem: Ben Zvi Institute, 2001), 127–139 (Heb.); “Moses’ Mother and Her Slave-Girl according to 4QExod^b,” *DSD* 9 (2002): 38–43; “Wave Breads for King Saul: 1 Sam. 10:4 in 4QSam^a and in the Septuagint,” *Meghillot* 3 (2002): 245–250 (Heb.).

55 A. Rofé, “The Nomistic Correction in Biblical Manuscripts and Its Occurrence in 4QSam^a,” *RevQ* 14 (1989): 247–254.

56 A. Rofé, “The Onset of Sects in Postexilic Judaism,” in Jacob Neusner, ed., *Essays in Tribute of H.C. Kee* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 39–49; “The History of Israelite Religion and the Biblical Text: Corrections due to the Unification of Worship,” in Paul, *Emanuel*, 759–793.

57 M. Segal, “1Samuel 2:3: Text, Exegesis, and Theology,” *Shnaton* 13 (2002): 83–89 (Heb.).

58 E. Tov, “Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism,” *JJS* 39 (1988): 1–37; “The Significance of the Texts from the Judean Desert for the History of the Text of the Hebrew Bible: A New Synthesis,” in *Qumran between the Old and the New Testament* (ed. F.H. Cryer & Th.L. Thompson; Copenhagen International Seminar 6; JSOTSup 290; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 277–309; “The Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert,” in Mazor, *On a Scroll of a Book*, 40–65 (Heb.); “The Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert: An Overview and Analysis,” in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 128–154. See further chapters 19–27 in the present volume.

59 Tov, *TCHB* (3rd ed., 2012), also published in Hebrew (1989, 2013), German (1997), and Russian (2001).

other texts and versions.⁶⁰ In his opinion, from the outset scholars should have an open mind toward all sources, and not turn to extra-Masoretic evidence only where MT is considered “corrupt.” This approach has practical implications in the case of such an important scroll as 4QSam^a, which is at least equally valid as MT. In *TCHB*, Tov subdivided the Qumran biblical scrolls into five different groups of unequal proportion: the most frequent groups are the proto-Masoretic and independent scrolls. Other groups are pre-Samaritan and LXX-like scrolls. The scrolls written by the Qumran scribal school are not included in the statistics.⁶¹

Tov also devoted a monograph to the scribal practices of nonbiblical and biblical scrolls.⁶² This study has many practical implications for the understanding of several individual scrolls. The distinction between scrolls written according to the Qumran scribal practice and the other scrolls is basic to this description, and among other things the features of this scribal practice are discussed at length.

Tov also researched the Qumran scrolls of Isaiah,⁶³ the relevance of the scrolls to the *Ketiv/Qere* practice, the only Masoretic scribal feature that is not paralleled by the scrolls.⁶⁴ For more studies on the Hebrew scrolls by Tov see below.

By far the longest Greek text, the *Minor Prophets Scroll* from Naḥal Ḥever, (8HevXIIgr), was published by E. Tov (see n. 20). This *DJD* edition includes a detailed analysis of the scroll’s translation technique, distinguishing the substratum of the original translation from the possibly revisional elements. In other studies Tov analyzed the other Greek Judean Desert scrolls similarly.⁶⁵ He

60 See especially “The Place of the Masoretic Text in Modern Text Editions of the Hebrew Bible: The Relevance of Canon,” in *The Canon Debate* (ed. L.M. McDonald & J.A. Sanders; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), 234–251.

61 Updated statistics are provided in “The Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert” and in *Scribal Practices*, 277–288, 337–343.

62 *Scribal Practices*, updating and rewriting a long series of preliminary studies. See the reviews by D.W. Parry; E.J.C. Tigchelaar in *DSD* 14 (2007): 365–372 as well as the latter’s “Assessing Emanuel Tov’s ‘Qumran Scribal Practice,’” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts* (ed. S. Metso, H. Najman, & E. Schuller; STDJ 92; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 173–207.

63 “The Text of Isaiah at Qumran,” in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 42–56.

64 “The *Ketiv-Qere* Variations in Light of the Manuscript Finds in the Judean Desert,” in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 199–205.

65 “The Nature of the Greek Texts from the Judean Desert,” *NovT* 43 (2001): 1–11; “The Greek Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert,” in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 339–364; “Determining the Relationship between the Qumran Scrolls and the LXX: Some Methodological Issues,”

thinks that the status of the latter manuscripts is equal to that of the Hebrew manuscripts from the same area. The Hebrew biblical Qumran manuscripts reflect a variety of textual forms, among them proto-Masoretic texts, while those of the later sites of Naḥal Ḥever, Wadi Sdeir, Murabbaʿat, and Naḥal Şeʿelim, as well as the earlier site of Masada, reflect MT exclusively. Similarly, at least some of the Greek Qumran texts probably reflect an earlier form of Greek Scripture, while 8ḤevXIIgr reflects a later proto-rabbinic revision. So both the Hebrew and Greek texts from Qumran reflect a community that practiced openness at the textual level, without being tied down to MT, while the other sites represent Jewish nationalistic circles, which adhered only to the proto-rabbinic text in Hebrew and a LXX revision approximating that Hebrew text.

Worthy of note is the first journal devoted solely to textual criticism that includes many papers on the Dead Sea scrolls: *Textus, Studies of the Hebrew University Bible Project*, vols. 1–25 (in chronological order, edited by Ch. Rabin, S. Talmon, E. Tov, A. Rofé, and M. Segal). Likewise, the Hebrew annual *Meghillot, Studies in the Dead Sea scrolls*, 1–IX (2003–), edited until 2010 by M. Bar-Asher and D. Dimant, contains several studies on the biblical scrolls, mainly by Israeli scholars. Israeli scholars also participated extensively in Schiffman, *Encyclopedia of the DSS*. An updated summary of the textual status of the scrolls was provided by E. Tov.⁶⁶

5 The Biblical Scrolls and Literary Criticism

It is generally assumed that the biblical books passed through two main stages of development: the stage of their literary growth up to a form that was final in respect of their content, and the copying and textual transmission stage of the completed compositions. Although the distinction between these two areas is largely open to doubt, research into these subjects is divided accordingly: literary criticism deals with the first area, the development stage of the biblical books, whereas textual criticism is applied to the second stage, their copying and transmission. In recent studies, however, the relevance of textual sources (especially the LXX and the Qumran scrolls) to the *literary* study of the Bible is

in E. Tov, ed., *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel, 1980 Proceedings 10SCS*, Vienna (Jerusalem: Academon, 1980), 45–67; “The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX,” in *Greek–Hebrew Bible*, 285–300.

66 See the studies of Tov cited in n. 58 and chapters 21 and 25 in the present volume.

often stressed. In Israel these aspects are studied especially by E. Tov, A. Rofé, and others. Within the framework of this analysis, various scroll fragments have been described as reflecting early recensional stages in the development of Scripture books. The following relevant studies are listed in the sequence of the biblical books. According to M. Segal, 4QReworked Pentateuch reflects an exegetical biblical manuscript deviating greatly from MT, rather than a reworked biblical composition.⁶⁷ Tov takes this view too, albeit with different arguments.⁶⁸ Rofé suggests that three Qumran phylacteries (Deuteronomy 5)⁶⁹ and 4QDeut^a (the end of the Song of Moses)⁷⁰ reflect early stages of that book. Mazor considers 4QJosh^a an early stage in the development of the Hebrew book,⁷¹ while according to Rofé this scroll displays a later, nomistic stage of MT sequence in the first chapters; Tov considers it a late rewriting.⁷² Rofé denies that 4QJudg^a is relevant to literary criticism.⁷³ Tov suggests that 4QSam^a reflects

67 M. Segal, "Biblical Exegesis in 4Q158: Techniques and Genre," *Textus* 19 (1998): 45–62; "4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch?" in Schiffman, *DSS*, 391–399.

68 See chapters 1 and 4 in the present volume.

69 A. Rofé, "Deuteronomy 5.28–6.1: Composition and Text in the Light of Deuteronomistic Style and Three *Tefillin* from Qumran (4Q128, 129, 137)," *Deuteronomy: Issues and Interpretation* (Old Testament Studies. London: T & T Clark, 2002), 25–36.

70 A. Rofé, "The End of the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32.43)," *Deuteronomy: Issues*, 47–54.

71 L. Mazor, *The Septuagint Translation of the Book of Joshua: Its Contribution to the Understanding of the Textual Transmission of the Book and Its Literary and Ideological Development* (Ph.D. Diss.; Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1994), 54–56 (Heb. with Eng. summ.); "A Textual and Literary Study of the Fall of Ai in Joshua 8," in *The Bible in the Light of Its Interpreters, Sarah Kamin Memorial Volume* (ed. S. Japhet; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1994), 73–108 (Heb.). According to Mazor, fragments 15–16 of this scroll present a recensionally shorter text than MT that runs parallel to the shorter text of the LXX, although the two are not identical.

72 A. Rofé, "The Editing of the Book of Joshua in the Light of 4QJosh^a" in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. G.J. Brooke & F. García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1994), 73–80; Tov: chapter 10 in this volume.

73 A. Rofé, "The Biblical Text in Light of Historico-Literary Criticism: The Reproach of the Prophet-Man in Judg 6:7–10 and 4QJudg^a" in *Border Line*, 33–44; "Studying the Biblical Text in the Light of Historico-Literary Criticism: The Reproach of the Prophet in Judg 6:7–10 and 4QJudg^a," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures* (ed. A. Lange, E. Tov & M. Weigold; VTSup 140/1; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2011), 111–123. The absence of this paragraph had been explained earlier as pointing to a pre-Deuteronomy text by J. Trebolle Barrera, "Textual Variants in 4QJudg^a and the Textual and Editorial History of the Book of Judges," *RevQ* 14 (1989): 229–245; idem, *DJD* XIV, 161–169.

a different edition of the Song of Hannah from those underlying MT and the LXX.⁷⁴ Rofé asserts that the added paragraph at the beginning of 1Samuel 11 in 4QSam^a, providing the background to the siege of Jabesh Gilead by Nahash the Ammonite, is not relevant to literary criticism but represents a late midrash.⁷⁵ Talmon and Zakovitch posit that the different hands in chapter 38 in 1QIsa^a reflect different stages of the development of 2Kgs 20:1–11.⁷⁶ Tov believes that 4QJer^{b,d}, together with the LXX, reflect an early redactional stage of Jeremiah.⁷⁷ Adopting this view, J. Ben Dov analyzes the relevance of Jeremiah 10.⁷⁸

Tov summarized the Qumran evidence relating to literary criticism, together with that relevant to the LXX.⁷⁹ Talshir authored a methodological study on textual and literary criticism,⁸⁰ and the Rofé Jubilee volume contains several studies devoted to this area.⁸¹

Studying the extensive literary changes that scholars often surmise in MT, Tov concludes that the realia of the Qumran scrolls do not allow us to presume that scribes inserted, omitted, or changed large sections in existing scrolls.⁸² According to Tov, these changes were not inserted in the form of alterations of a previous manuscript but as part of the ongoing writing by scribes.

74 E. Tov, "Different Editions of the Song of Hannah," in idem, *Greek-Hebrew Bible*, 433–455.

75 Rofé, "The Acts of Nahash"; "4QMidrash Samuel? Observations Concerning the Character of 4QSam^a," *Textus* 19 (1988): 63–74; "A Scroll of Samuel or Midrash Samuel? The Transfer of the Ark to Jerusalem According to 4Q51," in *A Festschrift for Devorah Dimant, Meghillot* 5–6 (ed. M. Bar-Asher and E. Tov; Haifa/Jerusalem: University of Haifa/The Bialik Institute, 2007), 237–243 (Heb.).

76 S. Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible," 328–332; Y. Zakovitch, "Assimilation in Biblical Narratives," in Tigay, *Empirical Models*, 175–196. See also Tov, *TCHB*, 310–311.

77 E. Tov, "The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Its Textual History," *Greek-Hebrew Bible*, 363–384; "The Characterization of the Additional Layer of the Masoretic Text of Jeremiah," *ErIsr* 26 (1999): 55–63 (Heb.).

78 J. Ben-Dov, "A Textual Problem and Its Form-Critical Solution: Jeremiah 10: 1–16," *Textus* 20 (2000): 97–128.

79 Tov, "Large-Scale Differences"; idem, *TCHB*, chapter 7.

80 Z. Talshir, "Textual and Literary Criticism of the Bible in Post-Modern Times: The Untimely Demise of Classical Biblical Philology," *Henoch* 21 (1999): 235–252. See also her study "Are the Biblical Texts from Qumran Biblical? 4QTestimonia and the Minimalists," in Bar-Asher and Tov, *A Festschrift for Devorah Dimant*, 119–140 (Heb.).

81 See Talshir and Amara, *Border Line*.

82 "Early Scrolls." Hebrew version in *Meghillot* 3 (2005): 191–204.

6 Textual Theories

From the early introductions to Hebrew Scripture onward (for example, that by Eichhorn),⁸³ the development of the biblical text has been outlined in broad terms; since 1947 it has included increasing reference to the Dead Sea scrolls. The first overall theory to involve the scrolls was the theory of the so-called "local recensions/text-types/families,"⁸⁴ which reduces the multiplicity of textual witnesses to three text-types: one current in Palestine (mainly SP, MT of Chronicles, and several Qumran scrolls), one in Babylonia (MT), and one in Egypt (the LXX). Talmon⁸⁵ and Tov⁸⁶ pointed out the weaknesses of this theory. Developing his own views, Talmon described the collection of Qumran scrolls as an "open-ended biblical canon."⁸⁷

E. and H. Eshel elucidated the origin of the Samaritan sect and SP on the basis of the pre-Samaritan texts.⁸⁸

Several Israeli scholars view the Qumran Psalters, especially 11QPs^a, as liturgical collections irrelevant to our understanding of the development of the canonical shape of that book.⁸⁹

83 Eichhorn, *Einleitung*.

84 W.F. Albright "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible," *BASOR* 140 (1955): 27–33; F.M. Cross, "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text," in Cross–Talmon, *QHBT*, 2782–2792; idem, "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts," *ibid.*, 306–320.

85 Talmon in Cross–Talmon, *QHBT*, 193–198.

86 E. Tov, "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls," *HUCA* 53 (1982): 11–27; *TCHB*, 158–160.

87 Talmon, "Old Testament Text"; "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible," in Cross–Talmon, *QHBT*, 226–263; "The Transmission History of the Text of the Hebrew Bible in the Light of Biblical Manuscripts from Qumran and Other Sites in the Judean Desert," in Schiffman, *DSS*, 40–50. The quotation is from S. Talmon, "The Crystallization of the 'Canon of Hebrew Scriptures' in the Light of Biblical Scrolls from Qumran," in McKendrick and O'Sullivan, *The Bible as Book*, 5–20 (11).

88 E. and H. Eshel "Dating the Samaritan Pentateuch's Compilation in Light of the Qumran Biblical Scrolls," in Paul, *Emanuel*, 215–240.

89 S. Talmon, "Pisqah Be'emša' Pasuq and 11QPs^a," *Textus* 5 (1966): 11–21; M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Psalms Scroll (11QPs^a): A Problem of Canon and Text," *Textus* 5 (1966): 22–33; M. Haran, "11QPs^a and the Canonical Book of Psalms," in *Minhah le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday* (ed. M.Z. Brettler & M.A. Fishbane; JSOTSup 154; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1993), 193–201.

7 The Qumran Biblical Scrolls at Israeli Schools, Universities, and Websites

The Qumran biblical scrolls are probably taught more widely at Israeli than at other universities.⁹⁰ Since 2003, the study of some biblical scrolls and Psalm 151 in the 11QPs^a version have been integrated into the official curriculum for general high schools,⁹¹ which is rather innovative for a country in which MT is the official text, so to speak. Much material on the biblical scrolls is available on the websites of Orion (see n. 9) and of the Shrine of the Book at the Israel Museum,⁹² and on that of Bible teachers at elementary and high schools.⁹³

90 Among other things, see the internal Hebrew University publication by E. Tov and M. Segal, *Textual Criticism: A Sourcebook* (Jerusalem: Academion, 2002).

91 See *tochnit hal-limmudim be-miqra' le-ma'arekhet ha-chinnukh ham-mamlakhtit* (hamazkirut hap-pedagogit, misrad ha-chinnukh; Jerusalem, 2003), 62, 84; *peraqim mis-sepher yesha'yahu le-limmud u-le-ha'asharah* (Tel Aviv: ha-merkaz le-technologiah chinnukhit, 1997), 10–11; Y. Amit, “Biblical Criticism in the Teaching of the Hebrew Bible,” in *Understanding the Bible in Our Times: Implications for Education* (ed. M.L. Frankel & H. Deitcher; Studies in Jewish Education 9; Jerusalem: Magnes, 2003), 101–113 (112) (Heb.).

92 <http://www.imj.org.il/eng/shrine>.

93 <http://mikranet.cet.ac.il>. See further E. Tov, “Electronic Resources Relevant to the Textual Criticism of Hebrew Scripture,” *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 8 (2003) [<http://purl.org/TCJ>]. Updated version: <http://mikrarevivim.blogspot.co.il/2013/10/i.html>.

The Qumran Hebrew Texts and the Septuagint: An Overview

The discovery in the Qumran Hebrew scrolls of single readings and fragments that are close to the LXX was an unexpected phenomenon that would be of major importance for several aspects of the text-critical analysis of the Hebrew and Greek Bibles. The idea that we would ever get close to the Hebrew texts from which the Greek translation was rendered had never entered anyone's mind. Had scholars been asked where to look for such scrolls, they would have been divided between ancient Israel and Egypt.

1 Textual Outlook at the Time of the Qumran Discoveries

When the Qumran scrolls were found in 1947, scholars already had well-developed views about the transmission of the biblical texts. With the discovery of the first Qumran scrolls, these views, including the depiction of the relation between the textual witnesses, were not altered because it always takes time for the ramifications of new discoveries to be absorbed. Scholars continued to determine the place of the newly found scrolls within the framework of the tripartite division of the textual witnesses of the Torah that had been developed earlier. With regard to the Prophets and Hagiographa, some scholars thought in terms of a bipartite division, while others adhered also here to a tripartite division. Scholars also continued the approach of previous generations in characterizing many Qumran scrolls as recensions or text-types.

The assigning of individual Qumran texts to a particular text-type is reflected in the literature from the first volumes of the *DJD* series onwards, when most of the new scrolls were described as belonging to the “type” of MT, while some scrolls were assigned to the “type” of the LXX or of SP.¹

1 For example, in *DJD* III, 61, 2QDeut^c was described as reflecting a textual tradition close to the LXX and the Vulgate. According to J.T. Milik, 5QDeut was systematically revised according to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX (*DJD* III, 170). For both, see below. Milik similarly described 5QKings as reflecting a mediating position between the recensions of MT and the LXX (*DJD* III, 172). While these three short texts did not display a convincing level of agreement with the LXX, other texts showed surprising proximity to the LXX. The first such scroll to be

2 The Hebrew Qumran Scrolls and the Reconstructed LXX *Vorlage*

The Qumran LXX scrolls and the Hebrew scrolls close to the LXX introduced spectacular new data to the text-critical analysis. At the same time, the Hebrew scrolls and individual readings were quietly and almost unobtrusively influential in another area. They provided welcome support for the correctness of an approach that had been an integral part of scholarship for more than three centuries, namely, the reconstruction of details in the *Vorlage* of the LXX by way of retroversion. Before the Qumran discoveries, elements in the LXX that differed from MT were reconstructed with the aid of intuition and parallel biblical passages, while some harmonizing pluses in the LXX could be reconstructed with aid of parallel evidence in SP. However, little external support was available for this procedure.

The masters in this area of reconstruction, from Cappellus (1650)² and Houbigant (1777),³ on to Wellhausen (1871)⁴ and more recent scholars, operated with such tools as grammars, lexica, and concordances, but actually their intuition remained their major source of inspiration. Guided by this intuition, the above-mentioned scholars, as well as many others, suggested many a retroversion for readings in the LXX that deviated from MT.

However, it was not until the discovery of the Qumran scrolls that it was recognized that the system of retroverting had been correct all along. For example, readings that had been retroverted from LXX-Samuel without real support were now found in 4QSam^{a,b}, thus vindicating the procedure.⁵

considered close to the LXX was the rather well preserved 4QSam^a. The approach to this scroll, which was quickly accepted in scholarship, was indicated by the name of a 1953 study by F.M. Cross, "A New Qumran Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," *BASOR* 132 (1953): 15–26. Similar claims were later made by Cross regarding 4QSam^b in "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran," *JBL* 74 (1955): 147–172, and in his monograph *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (London: Duckworth, 1958), 133–140. Cross had remarkably good insights into the scrolls that he considered to be close to the LXX and that were eventually accepted as such. The argumentation was completed when additional ("pre-Samaritan") texts that belonged to the "type" of SP were discovered at Qumran: 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QNum^b.

2 L. Cappellus, *Critica Sacra sive de variis quae in sacris Veteris Testamenti libris occurrunt lectionibus libri sex* (Paris: Cramoisy, 1650), 384–385; (Halle: Hendel, 1775–[1786]).

3 A.F. Houbigant, *Notae criticae in universos Veteris Testamenti libros* (Frankfurt: Varrentrapp Filium & Wenner, 1777).

4 Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis*.

5 This aspect was also stressed by Cross–Parry–Saley, *DJD* XVII, 26.

3 The Relation between the LXX and the Other Witnesses

When comparing the Qumran scrolls with the LXX and MT as well as other sources, both agreements and disagreements need to be analyzed. Further, in the analysis of the relationship between the LXX and a scroll, the textual character of all the witnesses has to be taken into consideration. Thus, if there is little textual variation between the various witnesses in a given book, as between the LXX and MT in Isaiah, both sources may relate in the same way to a Qumran scroll. Thus most scrolls of Isaiah and Ruth from cave 4 (see *DJD* XV and XVI) agree with MT and the LXX almost equally. In addition, in the historical books, the relation between a scroll and the LXX must be analyzed separately for the majority tradition of the LXX and for LXX^{Luc}. Furthermore, many scholars claim that common errors (secondary readings) shared by the LXX and a scroll carry more weight than agreements in presumed original readings.

There is no generally accepted method of determining the relation between the scrolls and the other witnesses. Some North American scholars pay more attention to the comparative (primary/secondary) value of readings than others.⁶ Other scholars pay more attention to the mere counting of readings (the statistical method). The first generation of scholars to analyze this issue paid attention only to agreements, but subsequently disagreements were also taken into consideration.

In my own thinking, editorial differences carry more weight than other variants. I take agreements as well as disagreements and independent readings into consideration. Further, I realize that shared errors carry more weight than shared common readings, but nevertheless I do not rely much on this type of reasoning because of its subjective aspects.

4 Qumran Scrolls Closely Related to the LXX

When analyzing the scrolls that are closely related to the LXX,⁷ we find different types of proximity. Most convincing are scrolls that agree with the LXX in the latter's special features, either in large editorial deviations from MT or a

6 F.M. Cross & R.J. Saley, "A Statistical Analysis of the Textual Character of 4QSamuel^a (4Q51)," *DSD* 13 (2006): 46–54; E. Ulrich, *DJD* XVII, 253–254 (4QSam^c).

7 For earlier brief descriptions, see E. Tov, "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX," in idem, *Greek-Hebrew Bible*, 285–300; F. García Martínez, "La Bible d'Alexandrie au miroir de Qumran," *RevQ* 22 (2005): 253–268.

large percentage of small meaningful variants. In all instances, disagreements with the LXX are also taken into consideration. In this analysis, we disregard occasional agreements with the LXX as well as statistical proximity to the LXX in insignificant details, both of which are analyzed below. I located seven scrolls that are close to the LXX, each of them in a different way.⁸ While 4QJer^b, when extant and reconstructed, is almost identical to the LXX, a few other scrolls are very close to that translation, sometimes in its characteristic features. In all these cases we wonder whether the LXX could have been translated from a scroll like the ones analyzed below:

- (1) 4QJer^b agrees with the LXX in almost all details against MT+,⁹ including the LXX's characteristic editorial deviations from MT: shortness (both are significantly shorter than MT+, in the case of the LXX by one-sixth) and sequence (in the case of 4QJer^b, different sequence in 10:5–12).¹⁰ Tov and Saley showed independently that the order of the verses in this fragmentary scroll cannot be reconstructed in any way other than that of the LXX*, i.e., 3, 4, 5a, 9, 5b, 11.¹¹ Vv. 6–8, 10, lacking in 4QJer^b and the LXX*, have a uniform character: They extol the Lord of Israel, while the remaining verses deride the idols of the heathen. It is most likely that the doxology in these verses was added in MT (ed. 11) as a counterbalance to mockery of the idols.
4QJer^b is very close to the LXX, but it should be remembered that only the ends of the long lines have been preserved. If this fragmentary status is disregarded, the LXX could have been rendered from a scroll like 4QJer^b. In all other cases discussed below, such assumptions cannot be made since the scrolls are slightly distant from the LXX.
- (2) 4QJer^d agrees with the major feature of the LXX (shortness) in the non-representation of the long names of MT. However, the scroll also differs from the LXX in seven small details and although it is very close to that translation, it could not have been translated from it.
- (3) 4QDeut^a agrees with the LXX against MT in the addition of two significant stichs in Deut 32:43 that give a polytheistic flavor to the song. The two

8 This number is higher than I recognized in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 148.

9 Exceptions are: פקדתיים v. 15] פקדתיים MT LXX* (ἐπισκοπήs αὐτῶν) and v. 18 יושב] יושב MT LXX (τοὺς κατοικοῦντας). Other differences between MT and LXX* derived from the translator's techniques.

10 See *TCHB*, 286–294 and Lange, *Handbuch*, 300–324.

11 E. Tov, *DJD* xv, 173 and R.J. Saley, "Reconstructing 4QJer^b According to the Text of the Old Greek," *DSD* 17 (2010): 1–12.

also agree in four small details, and differ in three small details. The LXX could not have been translated from 4QDeut^a. Besides, the scroll probably contained only the song in Deuteronomy 32, while LXX-Deut was rendered from a complete text of that book.¹²

- (4) 4QSam^a agrees often with the LXX against MT in significant readings while disagreeing with it in equally significant readings. This scroll is probably the most difficult one to assess:
- Agreements of 4QSam^a with the LXX and LXX^{Luc} need to be analyzed separately because LXX^{Luc} reflects the OG in 1 Samuel and 2 Sam 1:1–11:1, while the remainder of 2 Samuel contains a revisional text, *kaige*-Th. In each segment, the scroll relates differently to the LXX.
 - The significant agreements and disagreements between 4QSam^a and the LXX, as well as the many unique, seemingly contradictory, readings in the scroll, are in need of a special explanation.

Because of these complications, scholars described the closeness of the scroll to the LXX in different ways. Already in the first publication of a sizeable fragment of 4QSam^a, Cross recognized its proximity to the LXX, which he expressed in the name of his study (see n. 1). Polak likewise stresses the agreements between 4QSam^a and the LXX.¹³ On the basis of the same material, Tov downplayed the number of agreements between 4QSam^a and the LXX (LXX^B and LXX^{Luc}) by also taking disagreements between them into consideration.¹⁴ Without counting disagreements, Herbert considered 4QSam^a to be only “half-Septuagintal,” but in his mind the link between the two texts remained strong.¹⁵

12 The double translation in one of the stichs in the LXX could have been created at a later stage. Several scholars stressed the close relation between the LXX and this scroll: J.H. Tigay, *The JPS Torah Commentary: Deuteronomy* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996), 513–518; A. Rofé, “The End of the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32.43)” in *Deuteronomy: Issues and Interpretation* (London: T & T Clark, 2002), 47–54 (with bibliography).

13 F.H. Polak, “Statistics and Textual Filiation: The Case of 4QSam^a/LXX (with a Note on the Text of the Pentateuch),” in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)* (ed. G.J. Brooke & B. Lindars, S.S.F.; SBLSCS 33; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992), 215–276.

14 E. Tov, “Determining the Relationship between the Qumran Scrolls and the LXX: Some Methodological Issues,” in *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel, 1980 Proceedings 10SCS, Vienna* (ed. E. Tov; Jerusalem: Academon, 1980), 45–67.

15 E.D. Herbert, “4QSam^a and Its Relationship to the LXX: An Exploration in Stemmatological Analysis,” in *IX Congress of the 10SCS* (ed. B.A. Taylor; SBLSCS 45; Atlanta, GA: Scholars

In determining the relation between 4QSam^a and the other sources, we take the following aspects into consideration:

- Shared secondary readings of 4QSam^a and the LXX mark the strong connection between them.¹⁶
- On the other hand, the two texts disagree often in extensive groups of variants. Some of these disagreements belong to the pattern 4QSam^a ≠ the LXX MT, e.g. the long plus in 1Samuel 11 in 4QSam^a.¹⁷ In other cases, 4QSam^a differs from all other texts in its unique readings and exegesis (4QSam^a ≠ the LXX ≠ MT), e.g. in the Song of Hannah and in 1Sam 2:13–16. These unique readings consist of transmission errors and exegetical changes embedded in the scroll.¹⁸
- In 2Sam 11:1–24:25 (= *kaige*-Th), LXX^{Luc} (closely related to the OG), agrees often with 4QSam^a, while in 1Samuel the scroll agrees more frequently with LXX^B (= OG).¹⁹ The combined evidence for 4QSam^a is that this scroll always agrees with the OG representatives.²⁰

In sum, 4QSam^a is often very close to the OG (LXX and/or LXX^{Luc}) when disagreeing with MT,²¹ leading to the assumption that these two sources were closely related at an early stage.²² At the same time, many new read-

Press, 1997), 37–55 greatly stresses the agreements between the two texts in “secondary” readings. Taking his cue from P.K. McCarter, *1 Samuel, 11 Samuel* (AB 8; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980, 1984), he recognizes a stronger link between 4QSam^a and the LXX (LXX^B and LXX^{Luc}) than indicated by merely counting agreements and disagreements. In Herbert’s view, 4QSam^a is the earliest text among the sources available, leading to his further assumption that the LXX branched off from that tradition. In his view, LXX^{Luc} has no special affinity to the scroll.

16 For example, note the extensive doublet in 1Sam 2:23–24 and the erroneous mention of Mephiboshet in 2Sam 4:1, 2, 12 instead of Ishboshet in MT in v. 12 (together with the absence of a name in MT vv. 1, 2). For additional examples of shared secondary readings, see Polak, “Statistics,” 245.

17 See *TCHB*, 311–313.

18 See D.W. Parry, “The Textual Character of the Unique Readings of 4QSam^a (4Q51),” in *Flores Florentino*, 163–182.

19 See Cross–Parry–Saley, *DJD* XVII, 25.

20 In the calculation of Lange, *Handbuch*, 218, 4QSam^a agrees 143× with the LXX in the OG sections (as opposed to 168 disagreements), and only 39× in 2Sam 11:1 onwards (= *kaige*-Th), as opposed to 104 disagreements in that section.

21 On the other hand, S. Pisano, S.J., *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts* (OBO 57; Freiburg/Göttingen: University Press, 1984) downplayed the differences between these three witnesses, while maintaining the supremacy of MT.

22 Chronicles is often close to this shared text (see Lange, *Handbuch*, 218, n. 29) and Josephus

ings were created in both texts after their separation from one another.²³ Because of the complicated history of the LXX-Samuel, the proximity between the two is not always easily visible. Like Cross-Parry-Saley, *DJD* XVII, 25,²⁴ we list this text together with the others that are close to the LXX with the understanding that they were very close.²⁵

- (5) 4QSam^b is closely related to the LXX, as was recognized by Cross in the first publication²⁶ and by Cross-Parry-Saley in the final publication (*DJD* XVII, 222–223).²⁷ Counting “superior” readings in 4QSam^b, these authors find more such readings in the scroll than in the other sources. Besides, the scroll shares ten inferior readings with the OG (LXX^b and/or LXX^{Luc}). In my own analysis, I also found the scroll to be closer to the LXX than MT.²⁸ This conclusion is significant since 4QSam^b is one of the earliest Qumran scrolls (c. 250 BCE).²⁹
- (6) 4QNum^b often agrees with the LXX, but it also disagrees much with that translation. The most telling examples of the relation between the two

may have used a Greek text close to 4QSam^a; see E. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978) and Lange, *Handbuch*, 218, n. 32.

- 23 In spite of the many differences between the scroll, the LXX and MT, they do not reflect different literary editions (thus E. Ulrich, “A Qualitative Assessment of the Textual Profile of 4QSam^a,” in *Flores Florentino* [2007], 147–161 [160–161]) except for 1Sam 1–2 (MT, LXX, possibly 4QSam^a) and 16–18 (MT, LXX).
- 24 Cross-Parry-Saley, *DJD* XVII, 25: “... our early conclusion that 4QSam^a stands in the same general tradition as the Hebrew text upon which the Old Greek translation was based.” Similarly, Cross & Saley, “Statistical Analysis,” 54: “... 4QSam^a stands firmly rooted in the Hebrew textual tradition reflected in the Old Greek.”
- 25 At the same time, the overall value of 4QSam^a for biblical research as incorporating either a majority of valuable or interpretational readings still needs to be scrutinized. For valuable summarizing remarks, see Ph. Hugo, “Text History of the Books of Samuel: An Assessment of the Recent Research,” in *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (ed. Ph. Hugo & A. Schenker; VTSup 132; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 1–19 (3).
- 26 Cross, “Oldest Manuscripts,” 169–172.
- 27 “These data strongly support the view that the Old Greek was translated, presumably in Alexandria, from a Hebrew manuscript that was closely affiliated with the Old Palestinian text, such as that preserved in this old Samuel manuscript” (*DJD* XVII, 223).
- 28 Counting only cases of disagreement between the LXX and MT, and not taking into consideration the other sources or the unique readings of the scroll, I found it to be much closer to the LXX than to MT. While the unique readings of 4QSam^b are not insignificant, they are far less numerous than the other two mentioned categories.
- 29 See D.N. Freedman, “The Massoretic Text and the Qumran Scrolls: A Study in Orthography,” *Textus* 2 (1962): 87–102; Cross-Parry-Saley, *DJD* XVII, 220–221.

are several medium-sized harmonizing pluses that the scroll shares exclusively with the LXX.³⁰ At the same time, the first feature that comes to mind when characterizing this scroll is its great similarity to SP, especially in its major editorial pluses based on Deuteronomy (Num 20:13; 21:12, 22; 27:23). 4QNum^b should therefore be recorded as close to both SP and the LXX.

- (7) 11QPs^a col. XXVIII is closely related to the LXX of Psalm 151 of which it presents a longer version. Since the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX version has logical shortcomings in the flow of ideas, probably segments were removed editorially from the scroll. The background of this presumed shortening is probably related to an early version of this Psalm (= 11QPs^a col. XXVIII) that differed in key points from the depiction of David in 1Samuel 16. This shortening would have involved the removal of David's praise of God from the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX.³¹

I hesitantly add frg. 15 of 4QJosh^a to this list without including it in the statistics (see chapter 10 in the present volume). This enigmatic fragment agrees with the LXX in two details and its reconstructed text lacks most of 8:11b–13, as does the LXX. This agreement pertains to editorial differences between the LXX and MT.

The following types of proximity to the LXX are disregarded in our analysis:

4.1 *Occasional Agreements with the LXX*

From the beginning of the scroll publication, agreements of details in these scrolls with the LXX were recorded in the scholarly literature and the critical editions. However, several such agreements are irrelevant when the two agree in shared exegesis. In such cases, as appearing often in the large Isaiah scroll (see below), the two texts indeed agree while disagreeing with MT. However, such agreement is not indicative of a special relation between the two since the Greek translator and the scribe of the scroll sometimes reflect similar or identical exegesis of a text like in MT. This exegesis pertains especially to grammatical adaptations, such as changes in number and person.

30 22:11 = v. 5; 23:33b שפי וילך שפי [נקרה אל אלוהים וילך שפי] 4QNum^b LXX (καὶ παρέστη Βαλακ ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ καὶ Βαλααμ ἐπορεύθη ἐπερωτήσαι τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἐπορεύθη εὐθεῖαν) = v. 23a; 25:16 = v. 10; 26:33 שמות MT] ואלה שמות 4QNum^b LXX* (καὶ ταῦτα τὰ ὀνόματα) = 27:1; 32:30; 35:21 = vv. 16, 17, 18; 36:1 = 27:2.

31 See J.A. Sanders, *DJD* IV, 54–64. On the other hand, M. Segal, “The Literary Development of Psalm 151: A New Look at the Septuagint Version,” *Textus* 21 (2002): 139–158 considers the two versions to be parallel developments.

Other occasional agreements of a scroll with the LXX are relevant for the analysis of particular texts, and may often be very significant.³² However, given the fact of our incomplete knowledge of the ancient texts, this information does not advance our understanding of the relation between texts if no particular pattern of agreement between the two texts is visible. After all, we have access to only a small percentage of the ancient witnesses, and accordingly such agreements are not indicative of a special relation between sources in the web of relations between the LXX, MT, SP and the scrolls.

Accordingly, no special mention should be made of occasional agreements between a scroll and the LXX, but there are borderline cases. Thus, 4QDeut^h agrees in eight details with the LXX in Moses' blessing in Deut 33:8–11, often coinciding with 4QTest (4Q175). At the same time, this scroll also disagrees eight times with the LXX when agreeing with MT or SP, and contains exclusive readings. Its assumed closeness to the LXX³³ therefore cannot be established. The occasional agreements of the LXX and 1QIsa^a are either misleading³⁴ or insignificant. This pertains also to the agreements between the LXX and 11QPs^a.³⁵

By the same token, most agreements between the LXX and nonbiblical Qumran scrolls are occasional. Some occasional variants shared by the Temple Scroll and the LXX are of limited importance.³⁶ The apparatuses of the editions of Jubilees and all other parabiblical texts refer to many additional occasional agreements with the LXX. A special case is the biblical quotations in 4QTest (4Q175).³⁷ The first quotation in that scroll, from Exod 20:21, follows SP in its

32 Such occasional agreements are recorded in the *DJD* editions, the critical editions of the Bible, in the *CATSS* database, and in C. Martone, "Qumran Readings in Agreement with the Septuagint against the Masoretic Text. Part One, The Pentateuch," *Henoch* 27 (2005): 53–113; idem, "... Part Two: Joshua–Judges," in *Flores Florentino*, 141–145.

33 J.A. Duncan, "New Readings for the 'Blessing of Moses' from Qumran," *JBL* 114 (1995): 273–290 (288) cautiously suggests proximity to the LXX.

34 Thus J. Ziegler, "Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) und die erste Isaias-Rolle von Qumran (1QIsa^a)," *JBL* 78 (1959): 34–59 *contra* H.M. Orlinsky, "Qumran and the Present State of Old Testament Text Studies: The Septuagint Text," *JBL* 78 (1959): 26–33.

35 These agreements are recorded by S. Olofsson, *Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis: Collected Essays on the Septuagint Version* (ConBOT 57; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 176–192 ("Texts from Qumran and the Septuagint").

36 Thus L.H. Schiffman, "The Septuagint and the Temple Scroll: Shared 'Halakhic' Variants," in *Scrolls and Cognate Writings*, 277–297 (292).

37 See Tov, "Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls," 11–47 (34–35); S. Beyerle, "Evidence of a Polymorphic Text: Towards the Text-History of Deuteronomy 33," *DSD* 5 (1998): 215–232.

characteristic features,³⁸ while the third one is close to 4QDeut^h and the LXX. In the first place, 4Q175 is close to 4QDeut^h, which may have been the source for this scroll, and only secondarily to the LXX.

4.2 *Statistical Proximity to the LXX in Insignificant Details*

The aforementioned list of scrolls that are close to the LXX does not include all scrolls that statistically have a greater number of agreements with the LXX than with the other sources. The reasoning behind this approach is that mere statistical information concerning small details may be misleading since most scrolls are extremely fragmentary. Often, agreements pertain to small, unimportant details, and if disagreements are also taken into consideration, the agreements do not carry much weight. This is the case with 4QExod^b³⁹ and 4QLev^d.⁴⁰ 4QSam^c agrees slightly more with LXX^{Luc} = OG in Samuel 14–15 than with the main tradition of the LXX, which in these chapters contains *kaige*-Th.⁴¹ However, lack of evidence warns us not to draw any conclusion concerning a close relation between LXX^{Luc} and 4QSam^c.

38 The nature of the first excerpt creates a somewhat unusual impression as it seems to quote from two pericopes in Deuteronomy (Deut 5:28–29, 18:18–19), but in fact it contains merely one text that, as in SP (Exod 20:21), is composed of two pericopes that occur in different places in MT. The same texts are juxtaposed in 4Q158 (4QRP^a), frg. 6.

39 Pace F.M. Cross, *DJD* XII, 84: “4QExod^b is a collateral witness to the textual family which provided the *Vorlage* of the Old Greek translation.” However, the readings of this scroll are not characteristic of a trend of the LXX, with the possible exception of Exod 1:5 where the number of Jacob’s descendants is mentioned as seventy in MT+ (meant as a round number) and 75 in 4QGen-Exod^a 4QExod^b LXX*. The latter number is consistent with the names given in Gen 46:20 LXX (Ephraim, Menasseh, and grandsons Machir, Shuthelah, Tahan), but not with MT and the number in Gen 46:27 LXX. MT only mentions seventy descendants of Jacob (Gen 46:27; Exod 1:5; Deut 10:22). For an analysis, see W.H.C. Propp, *Exodus 1–18* (Anchor Bible: New York/London, 1998), 121–123.

40 4QLev^d contains pluses to MT in Lev 17:3, 4. The plus in v. 4, based on v. 3, is shared with the LXX. See K. Elliger, *Leviticus* (HAT 4; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1966), 219. The scroll reflects the LXX in two additional details, while in two other details it agrees with MT. See further E. Eshel, “4QLev^d: A Possible Source for the Temple Scroll and *Miqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah*,” *DSD* 2 (1995): 1–13.

41 See my analysis in “Determining the Relationship between the Qumran Scrolls and the LXX: Some Methodological Issues,” in *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel: 1980 Proceedings 10SCS, Vienna* (ed. E. Tov; Jerusalem: Academ, 1980), 45–67 (58–61). E. Ulrich, on the other hand, stresses the links with the Lucianic tradition: “4QSam^c: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14–15 from the Scribe of the *Serek Hay-yahad* (1QS),” *BASOR* 235 (1979): 1–25; idem, *DJD* XVII, 253–254.

In addition, the following texts have been mentioned as being close to the LXX, but the evidence is not convincing:

- 5QDeut. Milik's contention that 5QDeut (chapters 7–9) has been revised four times according to a Hebrew text close to the *Vorlage* of the LXX would have been of special interest had the evidence been more conclusive.⁴² Indeed, two of the corrections agree with the LXX against MT (the addition of וְאִשָּׁרָהּ in 7:15 and that of בָּם in 8:12). The third correction (8:19) is based on a reading that at best is dubious, while the fourth instance is probably irrelevant (9:2). At the same time, there are eight instances of disagreement between the LXX and 5QDeut and two agreements in minutiae. The sum of this evidence does not favor the assumption that this text has been corrected towards a Hebrew source close to the LXX.⁴³ In fact, no Qumran manuscript has as yet been identified in which corrections clearly tend towards either the LXX or MT.⁴⁴
- 2QDeut^c is described as follows by Baillet: "Le texte se rapproche de la LXX et de la Vulgate."⁴⁵ However, this fragment, of which a mere twelve words have been preserved in whole or in part, shows no close relation to either the LXX or SP.⁴⁶

5 Internal Relation between Scrolls Showing Affinity with the LXX

There is insufficient evidence for speculating on a special relationship between the texts that are close to the LXX. This issue can best be analyzed by contrasting these texts with the MT-group and the SP-group among the Qumran texts. Both groups are internally coherent, while texts that resemble the LXX do not form a close-knit textual family. They represent individual scrolls that in the putative stemma of the biblical texts happened to be close to the Hebrew text from which the LXX was translated. Since the *Vorlage* of each biblical book in the LXX was a single biblical scroll and not a family or recension, the

⁴² DJD III, 169–171.

⁴³ Lange, *Handbuch*, 103 accepts Milik's description.

⁴⁴ See my study "The Textual Base of the Corrections in the Biblical Texts Found in Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant & U. Rappaport; Leiden/Jerusalem: Brill, Magnes Press, and Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992), 299–314.

⁴⁵ DJD III, 61.

⁴⁶ This text, written in the "Qumran Scribal Practice," agrees more with MT against the LXX than vice versa.

recognition of Hebrew scrolls that were close to the *Vorlage* of the LXX does not contribute to our understanding of the development of the Hebrew text. The seven Hebrew Qumran texts that are close to the LXX comprise 5.75 percent of the 121 Qumran biblical texts that are large enough to enable analysis of their textual features.

6 A Septuagintal Text-Type?

The description of the character of the texts that are close to the LXX in the various Scripture books shows that they share only a limited number of features; therefore, it would be inappropriate to speak of a Septuagintal text-type, Septuagintal features, or the like. Nevertheless, so-called Septuagintal features are often mentioned in the literature, not on the basis of any evidence, but of general perceptions about the transmission of the biblical text as described below.

In the literature prior to 1947, the textual witnesses were usually described as being divided into three groups around MT, SP, and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX. These units were often named recensions or text-type. This terminology continued to be used, albeit less frequently, in the later literature. One often meets the term “Septuagintal” as a description of a Qumran scroll or readings in a scroll that agree with the LXX. However, this terminology is misleading since the LXX is neither a text-type nor a recension. The assumption of a Septuagintal text-type is unrealistic as there are almost no text-types in the realm of the Hebrew Bible and because the *Vorlagen* of the various books of the LXX have very few features in common. The Greek *translations* share certain characteristics, but their reconstructed Hebrew *Vorlagen* do not share such features. The main element shared by the Hebrew *Vorlagen* of the books of the LXX is that they were chosen to be rendered into Greek.

In view of the different backgrounds of the translations included in the LXX, it would be unexpected for the books of the LXX to have textual features in common. The Hebrew Scripture books were translated into Greek at different times and in different places (Palestine, Alexandria, and possibly elsewhere). When reviewing the nature of the Greek Scripture collection, we are struck by its heterogeneous character, which is most visible in the post-Pentateuchal books.

Textual features characterize the activity of the scribes who copied the scrolls or their background. Such features involve tendencies to shorten or expand, to add explanatory remarks, and to change or harmonize details. From among these various tendencies, we recognize only a large number of

harmonizing pluses in the *Vorlage* of the Greek Torah.⁴⁷ We recognize no other features that the *Vorlagen* of the Greek books have in common. The quality of the text (superior or inferior readings) is not a textual feature, which prevents us from stating that superior readings are typical of the LXX. By the same token, the fact that the LXX relatively frequently reflects a literary stage in the development of a composition different from that of MT does not render these details “Septuagintal.” The shortness of the LXX in 1 Samuel 16–18, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, ascribed to their early literary form, creates the impression of a common phenomenon. However, this is a very small group of books and they do not share textual features.

In sum, there is no evidence for a Septuagintal text-type or for characteristic textual features of the LXX.

7 Qumran Hebrew Scrolls Close to the LXX and the Origin of That Translation

Traditionally, the translation of Hebrew Scripture into Greek has been ascribed to Alexandria, making the LXX into an Alexandrian version. This assumption is based on some Egyptian-Greek features of the language and the Epistle of Aristeeas that relates the story of the sending of Hebrew scrolls by the High Priest Eleazar from Jerusalem to Alexandria. However, there is a growing understanding that several, possibly most, post-Pentateuchal books were produced in Palestine.⁴⁸ In the wake of that understanding, the Hebrew copies from which the books of the LXX were rendered were once found in Egypt in the case of the Torah and some additional books, and in Palestine in other post-Pentateuchal books. These original copies have not been discovered, but a few that are close to the Hebrew base of the LXX have been found. The discovery in Palestine of Hebrew scrolls close to the LXX has not provided an answer to the question of the origin of the LXX. However, we are no longer surprised to find such scrolls in Palestine, since probably several of the LXX books were translated there.

47 See chapters 12 and 31 in this volume.

48 See chapter 29 in this volume.

8 Parallels between the Hebrew and Greek Scrolls Found at Qumran

The Hebrew and Greek Qumran scrolls share important characteristics. The status of the Greek manuscripts from the Judean Desert runs parallel to that of the Hebrew manuscripts from the same area. The Hebrew manuscripts from Qumran reflect a variety of textual forms, among them proto-Masoretic texts, while those of Naḥal Hever, Wadi Sdeir, Murabba'at, and Naḥal Şe'elim, as well as the earlier site of Masada, reflect exclusively the proto-Masoretic texts (also named proto-rabbinic texts) later to be contained in MT (to be precise, the texts from the sites other than Qumran are closer to the medieval text than the Qumran proto-Masoretic texts⁴⁹). Similarly, at least some of the Greek Torah texts from Qumran probably reflect an earlier form of Greek Scripture, while 8ḤevXIgr reflects a later Jewish revision deriving from proto-rabbinic Jewish circles. Thus, both the Hebrew and Greek texts from Qumran reflect a community that practiced openness at the textual level and that was not tied down to MT, while the other sites represent Jewish nationalistic circles that adhered only to the proto-rabbinic (proto-Masoretic) text in Hebrew and the Jewish revisions of the LXX towards that Hebrew text. The differences between the texts and sites derive partly from their differing chronological backgrounds, but more so from their socio-religious backgrounds.

The LXX texts found at Qumran are not related in any way to the specific texts of the Hebrew Bible found there. For example, the Greek Torah texts show no relation to Hebrew Torah texts found there. Likewise, there are no Greek texts closely related to 4QSam^a. The only closeness between Hebrew and Greek texts found in the Judean Desert is between the Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Hever and the Murabba'at scroll of the Minor Prophets, since both reflect MT.

Finally, a word is in order regarding the scrolls, the LXX, and the modern Bible translations. Readings from both the Qumran biblical scrolls and the LXX found their place into the modern Bible translations. Before 1947, many the LXX readings had been accepted in the modern Bible translations, from the KJV (1611) onwards. Within that eclectic climate, it was expected that readings from the scrolls would also find a place in these translations. Since their discovery, readings from the scrolls have joined the LXX in competing with MT in modern Bible translations. Never was it more crowded in Bible translations.

In sum, the discovery in the Qumran Hebrew scrolls of single readings and fragments that are close to the LXX was an unexpected phenomenon that would

49 See chapter 22 in this volume.

be of major importance for several aspects of the text-critical analysis of the Hebrew and Greek Bibles. We analyzed the question of whether these scrolls changed the textual outlook of earlier generations. In our view, the discovery of the Hebrew Qumran scrolls provided much-needed support for the procedure of reconstructing the *Vorlage* of the LXX. There is no generally accepted method for determining the relation between the LXX and the other witnesses. Some scholars pay more attention to the comparative (primary/secondary) value of readings than others. Some scholars pay more attention to the mere counting of agreements. In the center of our analysis is a list of seven Qumran scrolls that are closely related to the LXX. We suggest that there was no internal relation between these scrolls. In our view, the Qumran scrolls that were close to the LXX did not form a close-knit textual family and a Septuagintal text-type never existed. An analysis of the Qumran Hebrew scrolls close to the LXX has some repercussions for understanding the origin of that translation. Finally, we suggest that the Hebrew and Greek scrolls found in the Judean Desert in the various Judean Desert sites reflect similar features.

Scribal Features of Two Qumran Scrolls

This paper is concerned with the statistical background of and scribal corrections found within the Qumran scribal practice, and not with its linguistic background, which has been illustrated well by Kutscher, Qimron, and Fassberg among others.¹ The composite scrolls 1QIsa^a and 1QH^a were copied by more than one scribe, each one writing a part of the scroll within the Qumran scribal practice. The differences between these scribes show that diversity is possible within the same scribal practice, and furthermore that all scribes were inconsistent within their own units. If the figures are taken at face value, apparent scribal inconsistency within these scrolls may sometimes be attributed to the presence of different spelling blocks and in one case from the use of a different source. These possibilities need to be taken into consideration when analyzing the statistical evidence, which as a whole is rather convincing. In the second part of the paper I turn to corrective additions after final letters, such as the *he* of עליהם. I hope to have collected all the relevant evidence with the aid of electronic databases. I analyze the questions of how, when, and where these added letters were inserted. I believe that they provide further support for establishing the assumption of a Qumran scribal practice.

That assumption, in short, runs as follows. Within the Qumran corpus, a group of some 160 nonbiblical and biblical texts has been isolated as reflecting

1 See the bibliography provided by S. Fassberg, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Their Contribution to the Study of Hebrew and Aramaic," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures*, Vienna, February 11–14 (ed. A. Lange, E. Tov, & M. Weigold; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 1:127–139. See further idem, "The Preference for Lengthened Forms in Qumran Hebrew," *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* 1 (Heb.; ed. M. Bar-Asher and D. Dimant; Haifa: Haifa University Press; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2003), 227–240. E. Qimron describes the language of the scrolls as a "spoken dialect of late Second Temple period Jerusalem and its environs"; see "The Nature of DSS Hebrew and Its Relation to BH and MH," in *Diggers at the Well*, 232–244 (234). The seminal monograph of Kutscher, *Language* was the basis for all subsequent work. See further S. Morag, "The Independent Pronouns of the Third Person Masculine and Feminine in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *ErIsr* 3 (1954): 166–169; M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Linguistic Structure and Tradition in the Qumran Documents," in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. Rabin and Y. Yadin; ScrHier 4; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1958), 1–37; W.M. Schniedewind, "Linguistic Ideology in Qumran Hebrew," *Diggers at the Well*, 235–252.

an idiosyncratic practice, the characteristics of which are visible in peculiarities in orthography, morphology, and scribal features. This group of texts is closely connected with the Qumran community, since it includes virtually all writings commonly agreed upon as sectarian (with the exception of seven or eight sectarian texts that do not display these characteristics). The texts found at Qumran can thus be subdivided into texts presumably copied by a sectarian group of scribes, and other texts which were brought there from elsewhere. The combined evidence shows that the great majority of the distinctive scribal features is more or less limited to texts that also display the Qumran orthography and morphology. The texts written according to the Qumran scribal practice could have been penned anywhere in ancient Israel, but they were probably written mainly at Qumran.

1 Problematic Aspects of Statistics

1.1 *The Two Scribes of 1QIsa^a*

Scribe A of 1QIsa^a left three lines empty on the last sheet written by him, at the end of col. 27. Scribe B started at the beginning of the next sheet with col. 28 (Isa 34:1).² It is unlikely that the two scribes worked concurrently, since the number of sheets needed for the first scribe's assignment could not be easily calculated; and thus scribe B, who started at a new sheet, would not have known where to begin. Several scholars have accepted the assumption of different scribes for 1QIsa^a, while others³ maintain that the two segments

2 For an analysis of the features of the two scribal hands of Isaiah, see M. Noth, "Eine Bemerkung zur Jesajarolle vom Toten Meer," *VT* 1 (1951): 224–226; C. Kuhl, "Schreibereigentümlichkeiten: Bemerkungen zur Jesajarolle (DSIa)," *VT* 2 (1952): 307–333 (332–333); W.H. Brownlee, "The Literary Significance of the Bisection of Isaiah in the Ancient Scroll of Isaiah from Qumran," in *Proceedings of the 25th International Congress of Orientalists* (2 vols.; Moscow: Periodicals Service Company, 1962–1963), 1:431–437; K.H. Richards, "A Note on the Bisection of Isaiah," *RevQ* 5 (1965): 257–258; R.L. Giese, "Further Evidence for the Bisection of 1QIsa," *Textus* 14 (1988): 61–70; J. Cook, "The Dichotomy of 1QIsa^a," in *Intertestamental Essays in Honour of Józef Tadeusz Milik* (ed. Z.J. Kapera; 2 vols.; Qumranica Mogilanensia 6; Cracow: Enigma, 1992), 1:7–24; M. Abegg, "1QIsa^a and 1QIsa^b: A Rematch," in *The Bible as Book*, 221–228 (giving statistics of different orthographic systems); P. Pulikottil, *Transmission of Biblical Texts in Qumran: The Case of the Large Isaiah Scroll 1QIsa^a* (JSOTSup 34; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 18–20.

3 Martin, *Scribal Character*, 1:65–73; Kutscher, *Language*, 564–566; J. Cook, "Orthographical Peculiarities in the Dead Sea Biblical Scrolls," *RevQ* 14 (1989): 293–305, especially 303–304.

of that scroll were written by the same scribe. However, the assumption of different scribes seems to be preferable, not only at the paleographical level, but also on other levels. Scribe B, whose handwriting differs from that of scribe A, inserted fewer corrections in guttural letters than scribe A,⁴ and he used different scribal marks (although possibly some of these marks were inserted by later readers). He also left out several groups of verses, which were filled in subsequently by his own or a different hand, in small letters, between the lines and in the margin.⁵

Scribe B also adopted a fuller *orthography* than scribe A (see Table 2, first part).

- (1) The figures clearly indicate the preponderance of the short form of the second person singular masculine suffix in nouns, prepositions, and verbs (ך-) in the first part of the scroll, as against the longer form (כה-) in the second part:⁶ 97/17 (or 85/15%) in A; as against the reversed preference in B (18/210 or 8/92%).⁷ This is probably the strongest evidence that two different scribes were involved in the writing of this scroll. Each adhered to his own practice, deviating from it only slightly. Sometimes the deviations occur in little groups. Thus in the middle of the impressive evidence for the full writing for scribe B (כה-), there is a “patch” of 4 short forms (ך-) in col. 51:13–14 (Isa 63:17–18).
- (2) For כה/כה the figures are equally clear: 13/1 for scribe A and 0/38 for scribe B.

Kutscher's arguments are very forceful, but he wrongly thought that the main criterion for the distinction between the two scribes was their different practices of orthography and morphology, while in reality the criterion consists in their differences in script and scribal habits. As for the different systems of scribes A and B, Kutscher had to admit, “I think that one scribe wrote the entire scroll, and that *for some reason* [my italics, E. T.] he decided to use *plene* spellings from chapter 34 and on” (564). Kutscher's main argument for a single scribe is thus based on the assumption of inconsistency in both segments of the book; he argues that also in modern times persons writing in Hebrew are inconsistent in their spelling habits (566).

4 Thus Giese, “Further Evidence.”

5 Cols. 28:18 (Isa 34:17b–35:2); 30:11–12 (Isa 37:4b–7); 32:14 (Isa 38:21); 33:7 (Isa 40:7); 33:15–16 (Isa 40:14a–16).

6 For a preliminary report, see M. Martin, “The Use of the Second Person Singular Suffixes in 1QIsa,” *Le Muséon* 70 (1957): 127–144.

7 In my presentation, the short form is always mentioned first and the full form is mentioned second, so: 18 short forms / 210 full forms for scribe B in this example.

TABLE 1 *Different spellings of ki in 1QIsa^a*

Chapters	Scribe A, cols.	כִּי	כִּיָּא
1:1–26	1	1	3
1:26–2:21	2	1	5
2:21–3:24	3	2	8
3:24–5:14	4	0	3
5:14–6:7	5	1	2
6:7–7:15	6	3	2
7:15–8:8	7	1	4
8:8–9:11	8	5	2
9:11–10:14	9	5	2
10:14–11:12	10	3	1
11:12–14:1	11	7	2
14:1–29	12	1	1
14:29–33:24	13–27	92	2 (Isa 16:9; 18:4)
	total	122	37
	Scribe B, cols.	כִּי	כִּיָּא
34–66	28–54	4 (2× by a diff. scribe)	168

- (3) There are remarkable differences between the two scribes in the writing of *ki* (for a total of 337 occurrences of *ki* in 1QIsa^a). Scribe B consistently writes כִּיָּא *plene* (168 cases [97%], with only four exceptions).⁸ On the other hand, scribe A has a majority of כִּי spellings: 126/39 (76/24%).

The internal differences within the columns of scribe A may reveal to us something of a pattern (see Table 1). From col. 13 (Isa 14:29) onwards until the end of the text written by scribe A (end of col. 27 at Isa 33:24), all the occurrences of כִּי are defective, with only two exceptions (16:9; 18:4). However, the first twelve chapters, subdivided into two blocks, display a different pattern. In the first block (cols. 1–7) כִּיָּא is predominant, while in the second block (cols. 8–11) כִּי is the predominant spelling; in both blocks, the predominant form is joined

8 Isa 52:5, 6 and supralinear corrections in Isa 38:21 and 40:7 by a different scribe.

by minority spellings.⁹ While it is difficult to draw conclusions on the basis of the spelling of a single word, it looks like this scribe oscillated regarding the spelling of this word in the first two blocks of columns (1–7, 8–11), but from col. 13 onwards he firmly employed the defective spelling כִּי.

The spelling pattern of *ki* may represent what J. Barr named “block spelling” in MT; that is, the presence of different spelling blocks in the same context.¹⁰ Barr’s innovative study showed that in MT, two different spellings sometimes “rapidly alternate” in the same context without any discernible system; while at other times a certain pattern may be recognized. Thus in Numbers 1–3 in MT we notice interchanging spelling clusters of שְׁמַח and שְׁמוֹחַ, arranged in groups of verses as if the scribe varied purposely,¹¹ although the groups are of unequal size, and the alternating spellings sometimes appear only as single occurrences.¹² Whether purposely or not, scribe A of 1QIsa^a vacillated between two spellings in different spelling blocks.

Scribe B also adopted a consistently fuller *morphology* than scribe A; the differences between the two scribes are usually quite clear:¹³

- (i) Scribe A adhered to the short form הוּא, while scribe B used the long form הוּאָה (66/0 in A and 2/29 in B).
- (ii) Scribe A adhered to the short form הִיא, while scribe B used the long form הִיאָה (6/0 in A and 3/3 in B).

9 The origin of these spelling blocks is unclear, and they are presented here as differences between columns, rather than differences between chapters, since neither presentation contributes to the solution.

10 J. Barr, *The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible* (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1986; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

11 שְׁמוֹחַ Num 1:2, 5, 17, 18, 20, 22, 24; שְׁמַח Num 1:26, 28, 30, 32; שְׁמוֹחַ Num 1:34; שְׁמַח Num 1:36, 38, 40, 42; שְׁמוֹחַ Num 3:2, 3, 18, 43.

12 Barr, *Variable Spellings*, 22. The phenomena recognized by Barr resemble individual features of playful spelling rather than a system. In a world in which there were no spelling norms, scribes oscillated between some variant spellings by clustering them in groups, inconsistently, but still with some design.

13 In all these cases, there is no evidence that col. 28 served as a transition area between the practice of scribe A and that of scribe B. If that were the case, possibly scribe B continued the work of scribe A, but the present evidence allows for the possibility that the two scribes were working simultaneously. Nevertheless in the first column of scribe B we find הוּא, contrary to B’s preference, in 28:17 (Isa 34:16) and 32:11 (Isa 38:19), while all other 29 occurrences of this pronoun in B present the long form. We also find עַמִּי in 28:7 (Isa 34:7), and a 5/4 relation between regular and lengthened pronominal suffixes in nouns in col. 28, much different from the ratio elsewhere in section B.

TABLE 2 *Significant differences between scribes A and B in 1QIsa^a*

	Scribe A	Scribe B
suffix כה/ך in nouns, prepositions, and verbs	97/17 (85/15%)	18/210 (8/92%)
כוה/כה	13/1 (93/7%)	0/38 (0/100%)
כיא/כי	126/39 (76/24%)	4/168 (2/98%)
הואה/הוא	66/0 (100/0%)	2/29 (6/94%)
היאה/היא	6/0	3/3
2d and 3d person plural suffixes in nouns	79/7 (92/8%)	53/111 (32/68%)
2d and 3d person plural suffixes in prepositions	26/14 (65/35%)	8/49 (14/86%)
<i>qəṭaltem/qəṭaltemah</i>	13/4 (76/24%)	0/10 (0/100%)

- (iii) For the suffixes of the 2d and 3d person plural in nouns,¹⁴ the statistics are 79/7 (92/8%) for scribe A and 53/111 (32/68%) for scribe B.¹⁵
- (iv) For the suffixes of the 2d and 3d person plural in prepositions the statistics are 26/14 (65/35%) for scribe A and 8/49 (14/86%) for scribe B.
- (v) For *qəṭaltem/qəṭaltemah* the statistics are 13/4 for scribe A and 0/10 for scribe B.

Beyond the issue of spelling blocks, the differences in orthography and morphology between the two scribes may be summarized as follows:

14 On the other hand, for the 2d and 3d person plural in verbs the statistics are similar: 23/0 (100/0%) for scribe A and 49/17 (87/13%) for scribe B.

15 Many of the short forms in scribe B (that is, the words differing from the majority system in B) pertain to two-syllable words, such as בולם, but this fact does not influence the statistics since the Isaiah text of section A does not differ from that of B in relation to these forms.

TABLE 3 *Significant differences between scribes A and C of 1QH^a*

	Scribe A cols. 1–19:25	Scribe C cols. 19:29 ff.
ביא/בי	100/24 (80/20%) 4 4/0 5 4/0 6 6/0 7 7/5 8 5/1 9 0/2 10 3/5 11 3/7 12 13/4 13 8/0 14 6/0 15 11/0 16 8/0 17 10/1 18 8/0 19 5/0	5/27 (16/84%) 19 1/1 20 1/8, <i>supra</i> 21 0/6 22 1/5 23 0/4 24 2/1 25 0/2
Suffix כה/ך in nouns and prepositions	136/258 (35/65%) 4 19/0 5 22/1 6 25/1 7 17/14 8 37/0 9 2/27 10 2/14 11 0/5 12 3/37 13 0/12 14 1/18 15 5/41 16 0/2 17 1/29 18 2/32 19 0/25	0/105 (0/100%) 19 0/19 20 0/21 21 0/7 22 0/12 23 0/33 24 0/5 25 0/6 26 0/2

	Scribe A cols. 1–19:25	Scribe C cols. 19:29 ff.
לוא/לא,	91/25 (78/22%)	1/17 (6/94%)
including	4 2/4	19 1/0
לל(ו)א, בל(ו)א	5 4/0	20 0/5
	6 5/1	21 0/3
	7 9/0	22 0/5
	8 3/0	23 0/2
	9 7/2	24 0/1
	10 3/0	25 0/1
	11 1/0	
	12 13/3	
	13 7/2	
	14 2/2	
	15 5/4	
	16 11/1	
	17 8/0	
	18 12/5	
	19 1/1	
לוא/לא not	84/7 (92/8%)	1/15 (6/94%)
including	4 2/0	19 1/0
לל(ו)א, בל(ו)א	5 4/0	2 0/4
	6 5/0	21 0/3
	7 9/0	22 0/4
	8 3/0	23 0/2
	9 5/2	24 0/1
	10 3/0	25 0/1
	11 1/0	
	12 13/3	
	13 7/0	
	14 2/0	
	15 5/2	
	16 7/0	
	17 8/0	
	18 9/0	
	19 1/0	

The distinction between the two scribes of the large Isaiah scroll is apparent, but neither scribe is consistent within his own practice. Statistical analysis is effective, but if the figures are taken at face value, the apparent inconsistency in the spelling of *ki* within the section of scribe A may actually reflect two spelling blocks, probably a result of the scribe's vacillation.

1.2 *The Three Scribes of 1QH^a*

Scribes A and C of 1QH^a differ in major ways.¹⁶ The transition between the scribes is clearly visible in col. 19 in the numbering system of Stegemann–Schuller's *DJD* edition.¹⁷ Scribe A copied until the middle of line 25 of that column, scribe B wrote only five lines (25–29), while scribe C wrote from line 29 until the end of the composition.¹⁸ Scribe C used larger, different, and less regular letters than scribe A.

The extent of the columns written by the individual scribes in 1QH^a is not as clear as it is in the case of 1QIsa^a due to uncertainty of the various reconstructions of the sequence of the columns of the scroll by Sukenik, Holm-Nielsen, Carmignac, Puech, and Stegemann–Schuller.¹⁹ I accept the most recent reconstruction of this scroll, that of Stegemann–Schuller, which is based on the principle that the distinction between the scribal hands determines the scribal divisions between the sections of the scroll, and that we should not be guided by spelling patterns since they may be misleading.

The major differences in orthography between scribes A and C are summarized in Table 4:

- (i) In the columns of scribe A the majority of the occurrences of כִּי are written defectively (100/24 or 80/20%) while the *plene* spelling כִּי־ prevails in C (5/27 or 16/84%).

16 The scribal features of the three scribes of this scroll were described by Martin, *Scribal Character*, 59–64.

17 Stegemann & Schuller, *DJD* XL.

18 For details see Stegemann & Schuller, *DJD* XL, 241–242.

19 E. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1955); S. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran* (ATDan 2; Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960); J. Carmignac, "Remarques sur le texte des hymnes de Qumrân," *Bib* 39 (1958): 139–155; idem, "Localisation des fragments 15, 18 et 22 des hymnes," *RevQ* 1 (1958–1959): 425–430; É. Puech, "Un hymne essénien en partie retrouvé et les Béatitudes," *RevQ* 13 (1998): 59–88; idem, "Restauration d'un texte hymnique à partir de trois manuscrits fragmentaires," *RevQ* 16 (1995): 543–558. For the reconstruction of Stegemann and Schuller, see *DJD* XL.

TABLE 4 *Summary of the significant differences between scribes A and C of 1QH^a*

	Scribe A cols. 1–19:25	Scribe C cols. 19:29 ff.
ביא/כי	100/24 (80/20 %)	5/27 (16/84 %)
suffix כה/ך in nouns, prepositions, and verbs	136/258 (35/65 %)	0/105 (0/100 %)
לוא/לא	91/25 (78/22 %) w/o א(ו)לל, בל(ו)א: 84/7 (92/8 %)	1/17 (6/94 %) w/o א(ו)לל, בל(ו)א: 1/15 (6/94 %)

- (ii) Scribe A *preferred* the pronominal suffix ך- for the form of the second person masculine singular (136/258 or 35/65 %), while scribe C used *only* the *plene* form כה- (0/105 or 0/100 %).
- (iii) Scribe A had a clear preference for the defective spelling of the negation לא (91/25 or 78/22 %), while scribe C preferred the *plene* forms (1/17 or 6/94 %). The differences between these two scribes are more evident statistically if א(ו)לל and בל(ו)א (usually spelled *plene* in A) are removed from the calculations: A's preference for the defective form then computes as 84/7 or 92/8 %; B's preference for the *plene* form as 1/15 or 6/94 %.

The differences between the two segments of the scroll cannot be coincidental. The two main scribes of 1QH^a, A and C, are distinguished in that scribe A wrote in a more defective spelling style than scribe C (similarly, scribe A of 1QIsa^a used more defective spellings than scribe B). In the categories other than the three mentioned above the scribes are rather similar.

I now turn to a significant pattern in the spelling practices within the columns copied by scribe A.

In the representation of the second person masculine singular suffix there is a clear difference between scribes A and C. At the same time, however, the character of the spellings used by scribe A seems to be rather inconsistent if the figures are taken at face value, although he prefers the full form (136/258 or 35/65 %). Here, too, the mere counting of numbers is misleading since the

presumed inconsistency was probably caused by this scribe's use of different sources for the *Hodayot*, even though we cannot exactly pinpoint the extent of these sources. The scribe's sources probably did not differ from column to column, but from *Hodayah* to *Hodayah*. This would not be a far-fetched assumption, since the *Hodayot* of 1QH^a are organized differently from those of the cave 4 *Hodayot* collections.²⁰ As a result, scribe A could have copied the individual *Hodayot* from different sources written in different types of orthography and morphology.

In the beginning of A's columns (cols. 4–8), we mainly witness the defective spelling of the suffix, while the remaining columns, 9–19, have a full spelling (as in the columns of scribe C). These data create the impression that scribe A's practices are inconsistent if one merely counts the occurrences, but in reality section A consists of different spelling blocks of the suffix כה/ך (see Table 5).

In other words, in the spelling of the suffix כה/ך, *Hodayah* 3 is defective (8/1), *Hodayah* 4 is full (0/5),²¹ *Hodayah* 5 is again defective (56/3), and *Hodayah* 6 and following are full. Probably these *Hodayot* were copied from different sources in which the pronominal suffix of the second person masculine was presented in different ways.

In short, in this part of my study I have tried to establish that statistics are a good source for distinguishing between scribes, and that as a rule the evidence is overwhelmingly revealing (see, for example, Table 2). At the same time, statistics ought to be used carefully since scribes may have written in different ways in some spelling blocks and they may have copied from different sources.

20 For example, in her publication of 4QH^a in *DJD* XXIX, 78, E. Schuller describes the differences in sequence between that scroll and 1QH^a. E.G. Chazon pointed out differences between individual *hodayot* and clusters of *hodayot* with the *hodayot* collections: "Liturgical Function in the Cave 1 *Hodayot* Collection" in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IQS in Ljubljana* (ed. D.K. Falk et al.; STDJ 91; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 135–150. See further H. Stegemann, "The Number of Psalms in 1QH^a and Some of Their Sections," in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January, 2000* (ed. E.G. Chazon, with the collaboration of R. Clements and A. Pinnick; STDJ 48; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 191–234.

21 This was already observed by Stegemann & Schuller, *DJD* XL, 100, in their comments on col. 7. See also A.K. Harkins, "Observations on the Editorial Shaping of the So-Called Community Hymns from 1QH^a and 4QH^a (4Q427)," *DSD* 12 (2005): 233–256 (249).

TABLE 5 *Spelling of the suffix ך/ח in Psalms 3–6 of 1QH^a*
(scribe A)

<i>Hodayah</i> (1–?) 3 (6:34–7:11) defective (8/1)
<i>Hodayah</i> 4 (7:12–20) <i>full</i> (0/5)
<i>Hodayah</i> 5 (7:21–8:40/41) defective (56/3)
<i>Hodayah</i> 6 (9:1–10:4) and ff.: <i>full</i> until 19:25 (16/242)

2 **Corrections in Spelling Made in Accord with the Qumran Scribal Practice**

The features of the texts that were probably copied by the Qumran scribal group, covering the great majority of the *sectarian* Qumran writings, but not all of them, have been described in the past.²² In the first part of my study I focused on two scrolls, each of which was copied by more than one scribe writing in the Qumran scribal practice, who differed in matters of detail. These texts show that there was room for individuality among these scribes. There was no consistency within the Qumran scribal practice, just like there is no consistency within the orthography of any of the books of MT.

2.1 ***Corrective Additions***

To the arguments given in the past for the very existence of the Qumran scribal practice I wish to refer here to a specific group of *corrective* additions in the manuscripts. Most corrections in the Qumran scrolls take the form of added elements, although there are also many deletions indicated with cancellation dots and reshaping of letters.

Many of the corrective additions in the scrolls are letters or words left out by mistake, e.g.:

22 Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 261–273. It is unclear how this view relates to the more recent study by A. Yardeni, “A Note on a Qumran Scribe,” in *New Seals and Inscriptions, Hebrew, Idumen, and Cuneiform* (ed. M. Lubetski, HBM 8; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2007), 287–298. Quite a number of these texts display the features of the Qumran scribal practice. In this study, Yardeni describes the script used by a single “Qumran scribe” who penned more than fifty, or possibly more than eighty, different texts, of completely different natures, biblical and nonbiblical, sectarian and nonsectarian, on leather and papyrus. The script of this scribe developed over the course of the years, and the scribe’s letters were penned in different sizes. These parameters leave room for doubt, but even if the view were correct for only a small number of manuscripts, it would still provide a welcome addition to our knowledge.

1QSam	4:5 (2Sam 23:12)	וִי־הָ	MT: וִיד
11QPs ^a	25:11 (Ps 143:5)	בִּיּוֹל	MT: בְּכֹל

Other corrections are linguistic or orthographical, usually in the direction of a full spelling:

TABLE 6 *Sundry spelling corrections (small sample)*

1QM	2:7	הגוֹיִם
1QH ^a	12:31, 31, 32	לִיא
1QH ^a	15:24	בח'ק
1QIsa ^a scribe A	17:18 (Isa 22:12)	צִיאַן
1QIsa ^a scribe A	23:27 (Isa 29:16)	יִאמֶר
1QIsa ^a scribe B	50:19 (Isa 62:7)	ירוּשָׁלַם

In addition, many of these changes correct towards spellings and forms that within the Qumran scrolls are characteristic of the Qumran scribal practice. For example, in those scrolls, **כי** was often changed to **ביא** to **הוא**, **אתם** to **הואה** to **הוא**, **אתמה**, etc. Interestingly enough, we can sometimes perceive the moment of inserting these changes, since the same scribe sometimes added them after he had initially forgotten to employ the spelling or form that constituted the majority form in his system.

A remarkably large number of such corrections pertain to the long pronominal suffixes characteristic of the Qumran scribal practice, such as 4QDeut¹ 10:2 (Exod 12:48) **אתכם** and 4QTest (4Q175) 5 **אחיהם** **לאהם**. In particular, scribe B of 1QIsa^a employed many such forms.²³ Two different conditions may be distinguished:

- (i) *The scribe recognized his mistake while writing.* An example is 1QH^a 10 (2) 24 **ובבריתך**: Upon writing **ובבריתך**, the scribe realized that he should have written the long form, with a *he*, which he then added before continuing the writing. A space is left between this and the following word, which

23 See below and J.P. Siegel, *The Scribes of Qumran: Studies in the Early History of Jewish Scribal Customs, with Special Reference to the Qumran Biblical Scrolls and to the Tannaitic Traditions of Massekhet Soferim* (Ph.D. diss.; Brandeis University, 1971; University Microfilms, 1972), Appendix III (242–244).

indicates that the scribe recognized his mistake just after he completed writing **וּבְבִרְיָתָךְ**. In such cases the scribe did not bother to change the final *kaph* to a nonfinal letter, especially as he did not always distinguish between final and nonfinal letters.

Most corrections are of this type, and they indicate, in my view, that the scribe must have copied from a text that was written in MT-like spelling. Otherwise I cannot explain the relative frequency of changes of this type.

- (ii) *The scribe recognized his mistake after completing the writing.* Less frequently, when the scribe recognized the mistake only upon completing the following word or later, the correction was made by using the *space* between the words. Thus, in some cases, the additional letter was added above the line, as in 1QH^a 20 (12) 24 **כִּי**, and 4QD^a (4Q266) 3:11 **מִרְעִיתָךְ**; or was written smaller than the surrounding letters, as in 4QapocrJosh^a (4Q378) 3:18 **עֲלִידָה**. These changes are usually made in segments in which the longer spellings represent the majority.

2.2 *The He Added to the Second or Third Person Pronominal Suffix after a Final Mem or Kaph, and Similar Additions*

I now turn to the actual evidence for the corrective additions, collected with the aid of electronic databases.²⁴ I searched for final letters in nonfinal position, and for raised characters. I hope to have located all the relevant evidence relating to these corrections. The evidence pertains to forms that I have identified as characteristic of the Qumran scribal practice, such as **מִרְעִיתָךְ**, **עֲלִיהֶם**, **הוּאִי** and the *aleph* of **כִּי**. In my analysis, I refer to the questions of how, when, and where these corrections were inserted.

In these cases, the scribe presumably copied his *Vorlage* **עֲלִיהֶם** as such, and then was reminded that he should have written **עֲלִיהֶמָּה**. In such cases, the scribe added the *he* and did not bother to change the final *mem* to a non-final letter, especially as he did not always distinguish between final and nonfinal letter forms. Similarly, in reference to some other scribal mistakes, when a letter was written after a final letter, that letter was left as is, see Table 7.

Table 8 records the evidence for the added letters of this type in the Qumran scrolls.

24 The evidence for letters indicated as raised and final in the middle of the word was located with the aid of the Qumran modules (ed. M. Abegg) in *Accordance* 8.1.1, and in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library* (ed. E. Tov; rev. ed.; Brigham Young University, 2006), a part of the *Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library* (ed. E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2006).

TABLE 7 *Sundry letters added after final letters by way of correction*

1QIsa ^a scribe A	1:8 (Isa 1:6)	בשם	
1QIsa ^a scribe A	3:17 (Isa 3:12)	דרך	
1QIsa ^a scribe A	23:24 (Isa 29:14)	חכסת	
1QIsa ^a scribe A	25:7 (Isa 30:24)	האדם	also 18:23 (Isa 23:17)
1QIsa ^a scribe A	26:26 (Isa 32:15)	לכרסל	
1QIsa ^a scribe B	28:10 (Isa 34:10)	ויוסם	
1QIsa ^a scribe B	43:14 (Isa 51:23)	ותשימי	
1QpHab	5:3	עמי	written in the space
4QTest (4Q175)	18	יש'מוקטורה	written in the space
4QDibHam ^a (4Q504)	9:4	ישימו	
11QPs ^a	4:12 (Ps 126:3)	עסנו	

TABLE 8 *Letters added after final letters by way of correction*(i) *He* added after final *mem* (54×)

1QIsa ^a scribe A	7:23 (Isa 14:22)	עליהם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	28:8 (Isa 34:7)	ארצם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	34:20 (Isa 41:16)	אותם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	37:24 (Isa 44:18)	לבותם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	38:30 (Isa 45:20)	פסלם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	42:1 (Isa 50:1)	אמכם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	42:10 (Isa 50:10)	בכם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	42:15 (Isa 51:2)	תחוללכם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	43:17 (Isa 52:3)	נמכרתם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	45:22 (Isa 55:3)	נפשכם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	46:20 (Isa 56:7)	עולותיהם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	47:8 (Isa 57:8)	משכבם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	47:22 (Isa 58:1)	פשעיהם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	47:23 (Isa 58:1)	חטאותם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	48:7 (Isa 58:12)	מקוסם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	48:13 (Isa 59:2)	וחטאתיכם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	48:14 (Isa 59:3)	כפיכם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	48:17 (Isa 59:6)	במעשיהם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	50:6 (Isa 61:9)	רואיהם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	51:2 (Isa 63:6)	ואשכירם	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	52:6 (Isa 65:7)	פועלתם	space after <i>he</i>

(i) *He* added after final *mem* (54×)

1QIsa ^a scribe B	52:7 (Isa 65:7)	חיקסה	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	53:15 (Isa 66:4)	ובמגורותיהסה	space after <i>he</i>
1QpHab	12:14	להסה	space after <i>he</i>
4QDeut ^f	10:2 (Exod 12:48)	אתכסה	space after <i>he</i>
4QTest (4Q175)	5	לאהסה	space after <i>he</i>
4QTest (4Q175)	5	אחיהסה	space after <i>he</i>
4QTest (4Q175)	6	אליהסה	space after <i>he</i>
4QSapiential Work (4Q185)	1–2 ii 7	ואתסה	<i>he</i> poss. added in left margin
4QJub ^f (4Q221)	3:4	ההסה	fragmentary
4QToh A (4Q274)	3 i 8	בהסה	fragmentary
4QRP ^c (4Q365)	32:9	[בי]דכמסה	fragmentary
4QMMT ^d (4Q397)	6–13:10	לה[ס]ה	fragmentary
4QParaGen–Exod (4Q422)	3:8	בבתי[ה]סה	space after <i>he</i>
4QParaGen–Exod (4Q422)	3:8	פ[]הסה	space after <i>he</i>
4QParaGen–Exod (4Q422)	3:9	מנקיהסה	space after <i>he</i>
4QParaGen–Exod (4Q422)	3:9	ב[בתי]הסה	space after <i>he</i>
4QPers Prayer (4Q443)	12 i 3	להסה[space after <i>he</i> , in margin
4QNarrative C (4Q462)	1:12	[יהסה	space after <i>he</i>
4QM ^a (4Q491)	13:5	ידסה	space after <i>he</i>
4QpapPrQuot (4Q503)	14:2	ש[סכה	space after <i>he</i>
4QDibHam ^a (4Q504)	3 ii 19	[הסה	space after <i>he</i>
4QDibHam ^a (4Q504)	18:2	[יהסה	space after <i>he</i>
4QpapPrFêtes ^c (4Q509)	9–10 i 3	[ססה	space after <i>he</i>
11QPs ^a (11Q5)	18:11 (Ps 154:13)	אוכלסה ²⁵	space after <i>he</i>
11QPs ^a (11Q5)	19:6 (11QPs ^a Plea)	מהסה	end of the line, smaller <i>he</i>
11QPs ^a (11Q5)	26:2 (Ps 149:8)	ונכבדיהסה	space after <i>he</i>
11QSefer ha-Milh (11Q14)	1 ii 8	ארצכסה	space after <i>he</i>
11QT ^a (11Q19)	2:6	מזבח[ח]תיהסה	space after <i>he</i>
11QT ^a (11Q19)	39:5	סה[uncertain, space after <i>he</i>
11QT ^a (11Q19)	41:13	ולפניסה	space after <i>he</i>

25 Followed by שתותמה without the final *mem*.

TABLE 8 *Letters added after final letters by way of correction (cont.)*(i) *He* added after final *mem* (54×)

11QT ^a (11Q19)	49:10	לבבסה	space after <i>he</i>
11QT ^b (11Q20) ²⁶	5:24	ומנחתסה	above space between words

(ii). *He* added after final *kaph* (9×)

1QH ^a	10:24 (2:24)	ובבריתדה	space after <i>he</i>
1QH ^a	15 (7):32	ח{כ}מתדה	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	31:6 (Isa 38:5)	ימידה	space after <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	40:9 (Isa 48:4)	עורפך ה	minute space between <i>pe</i> and <i>he</i>
1QIsa ^a scribe B	48:6 (Isa 58:11)	ועצמותידה	<i>he</i> in space between the words
4QD ^a (4Q266)	11:13	מרעיתדה	end of the line
4QapocrJosh ^a (4Q378)	3 i 8	עלידה	end of the line
4QInstr ^c (4Q417)	2 ii + 23 7	בדה	above the space between words

(iii) *Aleph* added supralinearly to *ki* (6×) above the space between words or in the line (3×)²⁷

1QH ^a	7 (15):20	כיא	in v. 25 the <i>aleph</i> is written in the space between the words and in vv. 35, 37 at the end of the line.
	7 (15):25, 35, 37	כיא	

26 *מנחתמה* occurs frequently in 11Q19 (e.g., 17:14, 20:8, 25:6, 14, 28:11) and 11Q20 (3:22, 4:5).

27 According to Martin, *Scribal Character*, 478, 483, 485, and Stegemann & Schuller, *DJD XL*, 102, 105, 160, 257, the letters were added by a corrector, possibly scribe B.

(iii) *Aleph* added supralinearly to *ki* (6×) above the space between words or in the line (3×)

	12 (4):6	כִּי־א
	12 (4):9	כִּי־א
	20 (7):24	כִּי־א
4QD ^b (4Q267)	9 v 5	כִּי־א

If this evidence regarding the added letters in the Qumran scrolls is as exhaustive as I think it is, it shows that the corrections of the types described here were found exclusively in the texts that for other reasons have been ascribed to the Qumran scribal practice, with the exception of 4QSapiential Work (4Q185) and 4QapocrJosh^a (4Q378). The easiest explanation of the procedure followed is that the scribe copied from a manuscript that contained words of the type of אֶרֶצָם, forgot that his preferred form is אֶרֶצָמָה, then added the *he* after the final *mem* of אֶרֶצָם as an afterthought, followed by a space and by the next word. Since the corrections were made in one direction only, namely towards the extremely full spelling of the Qumran scribal practice (rather than the reverse), this procedure further strengthens, in my view, the assumption of a Qumran scribal practice.²⁸ This assumption pertains especially to those environments in which the full spelling prevails. Thus in 1QH^a 9–19 the great majority of the pronominal suffixes of the second person singular were written *plene*. Therefore in 15 (7):32 the scribe felt the need to correct an earlier spelling of חֲכַמְתֶּךָ to the more frequent one in those columns by adding a *he*: חֲכַמְתֶּךָ־ה. The same correction is found in an adjacent column, 10 (2):24 וּבְבִרְיִתְךָ־ה.

I suggest that forms like עֲלִיהֶם reflect a certain thought process of the Qumran scribes, involving some form of an oversight. This assumption would explain why such forms appear more frequently in certain sources than in others. By far the greatest conglomeration of these added letters after final letters (see Table 8 i) is in the columns of scribe B of the large Isaiah scroll (22 times of a total of 54 such instances in the Qumran scrolls, biblical and nonbiblical). Within that scroll, some 13 % of all the relevant forms were written in this way; especially in col. 18, which involves a rather high percentage of the total (all the 2d and 3d person suffixes in scribe B's columns are 231, of

28 Thus also Schniedewind, "Linguistic Ideology," 252: "It should be noted at this point that scribal corrections are toward Qumran scribal practice, not toward the standard."

which 170 are long forms). It is not impossible that all 22 of these instances represent oversights. Alternatively, these forms represent some form of a *custos* reminding the reader of the earlier scribal system. In that case, forms like עליהם represent some pedantic way to show that the scribe knew that the earlier form was written with a final *mem* or *kaph*, and that the added *he* represents the new convention. In 4QTest (4Q175), the three forms with *he* after the final *mem* (see Table 8a) are the majority (lines 5, 5, 6), since elsewhere in that text we find only one short form (בניהם 4) and one long one (שניהמה 25).

In sum, the composite scrolls 1QIsa^a and 1QH^a were copied by more than one scribe, with each writing a part of the scroll within the Qumran scribal practice. The differences between these scribes show that diversity is possible within the same scribal practice, and furthermore that all scribes were inconsistent within their own units. I suggested that the apparent inconsistency within these scrolls, if the figures are taken at face value, sometimes derives from different spelling blocks and in one case from the use by a scribe of different sources. In the second part of my study I turned to corrective additions after final letters, such as the *he* of עליהם. I hope to have collected the relevant evidence for such additions with the aid of electronic databases. These corrections were inserted especially by the second scribe of 1QIsa^a. I believe that they provide further support for establishing the assumption of a Qumran scribal practice since they always correct towards the full Qumran spelling and never away from it.

The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Proximity of the Pre-Samaritan Qumran Scrolls to the SP*

The study of the Samaritans and the scrolls converge at several points, definitely with regard to the biblical scrolls, but also regarding several nonbiblical scrolls.

Recognizing the similarities between the SP and several Qumran biblical scrolls, some scholars suggested that these scrolls, found at Qumran, were actually Samaritan. This assumption implies that these scrolls were copied within the Samaritan community, and somehow found their way to Qumran. If correct, this view would have major implications for historical studies, and for the understanding of the Qumran and Samaritan communities. This view could imply that Samaritans lived or visited at Qumran, or that the Qumran community received Samaritan documents, but other scenarios are possible as well. A rather extreme suggestion, proposed by Thord and Maria Thordson, would be that the inhabitants of Qumran were not Jewish, but Samaritan Essenes who fled to Qumran after the destruction of the Samaritan Temple by John Hyrcanus in 128 BCE.¹ Although this view is not espoused by many scholars, it needs to be taken seriously. The major proponent of the theory that Samaritan scrolls were found at Qumran was M. Baillet in a detailed study of the readings of the SP agreeing with the Qumran texts known until 1971.² Baillet provided no specific arguments for this view other than the assumption of a close relation between the Essenes and the Samaritans suggested by J. Bowman³ and

* I devote this paper to the two areas that were in the center of Alan Crown's scholarly interests, the Samaritans and the Scrolls, in that sequence. For Alan the Samaritans were more central, while for me the scrolls are in the center of my interest. For both of us, the other area was also significant, and Alan and I met in the middle.

1 Th. & M. Thordson, *Qumran and the Samaritans* (Ingårö, Sweden: published privately, 1996), reviewed by I. Hjelm in *DSD* 6 (1999): 94–99.

2 M. Baillet, "Le texte samaritain de l'Exode dans les manuscrits de Qumrân," in *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer* (ed. A. Caquot and M. Philonenko; Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1971), 363–381. See also idem, "Les divers états du Pentateuque Samaritain," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 531–545. On p. 539 of that study, Baillet mentioned scribal phenomena in Qumran that he ascribed to the tradition of the Samaritan scribes.

3 J. Bowman, "Contact between Samaritan Sects and Qumrân?" *VT* 7 (1957): 184–189; idem,

Massingberd Ford (later continued by Dexinger)⁴ based on theological ideas and institutions considered to be common to both groups. Had this study been written in 1990 or 2011, many additional agreements between SP and the Qumran scrolls could have been listed. However, this approach, not accepted by other scholars, is untenable, as it is based on the assumption that every reading found in SP is characteristic of that version only. Today, most scholars realize that occasional agreements between SP and a Qumran scroll do not justify the presumption of a close relation between these two witnesses. The proposal of such proximity should have been based on exclusive agreements in significant details. Had Baillet adopted a statistical approach in 1971, he would probably have concluded that only 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QRP^a (4Q158) are close to the SP in Exodus. We now know several additional sources (see below), but the list of sources containing so-called Samaritan readings is much smaller than the one provided by Baillet.

When looking for Samaritans in the nonbiblical Qumran texts, we find them in 4Q372 frg. 1, usually regarded as reflecting an anti-Samaritan polemic.⁵

1 SP and the Qumran Scrolls

This paper does not deal with the relation between the Samaritans and the Essenes in general, or between the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Samaritan literature, but with the relation between SP and the Qumran scrolls. In this analysis, we disregard occasional agreements between a Qumran scroll and the SP, such as were listed by M. Baillet, because such agreements are not indicative of any special connection between these two sources. Instead, we focus on Qumran biblical scrolls that were close to the SP in central issues in which they disagree with the other sources.

Samaritanische Probleme: Studien zur Verhältnis von Samaritanertum, Judentum und Urchristentum (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1967), 77–96.

4 J. Massingberd Ford, “Can we Exclude Samaritan Influence from Qumran?” *RevQ* 6 (1967): 109–129; F. Dexinger, “Samaritan Origins and the Qumran Texts,” in: *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site* (ed. M.O. Wise, N. Golb, J.J. Collins, and D.G. Pardee, Vol. 722 of *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 231–249.

5 4Q371–373 were published by E. Schuller and M.J. Bernstein as “4QNarrative and Poetic Composition^{a-c}” in *DJD* XXVIII, 151–204. See also E. Schuller, “4Q372 1: A Text about Joseph,” *RevQ* 14 (1990): 349–376 and M. Thiessen, “4Q372 1 and the Continuation of Joseph’s Exile,” *DSD* 15 (2008): 380–395.

The proximity between a scroll and SP is suggested by their exclusive agreement in characteristic readings. The major group of such readings is a group that we name editorial readings or changes, that is, readings deriving from a period when Hebrew Scripture was still being edited. Another characteristic group pertains to textual harmonizations common to the SP, another Hebrew source, and often also the LXX. A third group of common characteristic readings pertains to typological readings, such as facilitating readings. In the analysis of the agreements, statistical information is employed, even though it is often problematic. When counting points of agreement and disagreement, one ought to consider especially characteristic agreements of the types just mentioned, while disregarding agreements in small details.

Before embarking on an analysis, we repeat the main facts about SP. The SP contains the text of the Torah written in a special version of the early Hebrew script, preserved for centuries by the Samaritan community. SP contains a few ideological elements that form a thin layer added to an otherwise non-sectarian early text, very similar to so-called pre-Samaritan texts found at Qumran. Scholars are divided in their opinion on the date of the creation of the Samaritan text. Often the pre-Samaritan texts and SP are together named the SP group.

The very existence of pre-Samaritan scrolls, accepted by most scholars,⁶ is contested by some scholars, especially by those specializing in the study of the Samaritans.⁷ However, the exclusive agreements between the members of the SP group leave little doubt with regard to their close relationship, to be

6 E.g., P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, & J.E. Sanderson, *DJD* 1X, 53–130; Dexinger, “Samaritan Origins,” 232–234; E. & H. Eshel, “Dating the Samaritan Pentateuch’s Compilation in Light of the Qumran Biblical Scrolls,” in Paul, *Emanuel*, 215–240; S.W. Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 19–38; eadem, “The Pentateuch as Found in the pre-Samaritan Texts and 4QReworked Pentateuch,” in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period* (ed. H. von Weissenberg et al.; BZAW 419; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011) 123–136; B. Lemmelijn, *A Plague of Texts? A Text-Critical Study of the So-called ‘Plagues Narrative’ in Exodus 7:14–11:10* (OTS 56; Leiden: Brill, 2009); Zahn, *Rethinking*, 135–177. For a summary, see U. Schattner-Rieser, “Prä-, Proto-, und Antisamaritanisches in den Qumrantexten,” in *Qumran aktuell: Texte und Themen der Schriften vom Toten Meer* (ed. S. Beyerle & J. Frey; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Theologie, 2011), 67–109.

7 See especially Z. Ben-Hayyim, “Comments on the Use of the Term ‘Proto-Samaritan,’” in *Language Studies* V–VI (Heb.; Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1992): 13–23; Tal-Florentin, *Samaritan Version* compare the readings of SP with MT, while disregarding characteristic agreements with pre-Samaritan scrolls. The editors of this very valuable edition are aware of the pre-Samaritan scrolls (see p. 23 and the very long note 31 on pp. 23–24; p. 33 and n. 53 on p. 33). See chapter 17 in the present volume.

discussed in paragraphs a–b. Our major assignment is to examine the proximity of SP and the pre-Samaritan texts, also involving an analysis of the differences between them.

1.1 *Large Editorial Changes*

The members of the SP group exclusively share characteristic elements, which are best described as editorial intervention in the text. This editorial intervention is visible in medium-sized and large changes, mainly additions, sometimes changing the meaning of the text.⁸ These changes usually involve the duplication of other Torah verses (with adaptation of names and verbal forms) and a few rearrangements, but no omissions, following a strong inclination in SP not to alter the content of the divine word. The changes should be considered editorial rather than scribal-harmonizing, such as reflected in harmonizing alterations in small details in SP. The principle and substance of the latter changes is shared with the LXX (see below), while the editorial changes described here are characteristic of the SP group only. Its scribes were especially attentive to what they considered to be incongruence within and between stories in Scripture. Particular attention was paid to the presentation of the spoken word, especially that of God and Moses that was duplicated from one context into another when the editor considered it lacking. Ultimately, the changes reflect theological concerns.

The duplications reflect systematic editorial reworking of specific stories as well as incidental pericopes.⁹ These editorial additions, concentrated in two narrative blocks¹⁰ as well in additional chapters, are also found in the following five biblical scrolls and one Scripture quotation (in 4QTest).

-
- 8 See M. Segal, "The Text of the Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Materia giudaica* 12 (2007): 5–20; E. Tov, "Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch" in idem, *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 57–70; Kartveit, *Samaritans*, 259–312; Zahn, *Rethinking*, 135–177; E. Ulrich, "The Evolutionary Growth of the Pentateuch in the Second Temple Period," in *Pentateuchal Traditions in the Late Second Temple Period: Proceedings of the International Workshop in Tokyo, August 28–31, 2007* (ed. A. Moriya & G. Hata; JSJSup 158; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 39–56.
 - 9 For a description, see *TCHB*, 80–82; Segal, "Text"; Kartveit, *Samaritans*, 259–312; Zahn, *Rethinking*, 135–177. Kartveit names these elements a "Moses layer" in the pre-Samaritan texts, that enhanced the status of Moses as a prophet, especially in the addition of Deut 18:18–22 to the text of Exod 20:21 (17) (*ibid.*, 280–281; see below). However, the editorial principles behind that text are visible also in other stories, unconnected with Moses, such as in the duplication of Jacob's dream in Gen 30:36 in 4QRP^b (4Q364), frg. 4b–e ii, 21–26.
 - 10 (1) With pedantic precision, the editor compared the details of the speech in Deuteronomy 1–3 with the preceding books of the Torah. If a detail was not mentioned explicitly in

4QpaleoExod^m. This is a well-preserved scroll containing remnants of many chapters of Exodus (large sections of 44 columns from Exodus 6–37), though the Decalogue is not preserved, and like SP, written in the ancient Hebrew script. For a description of the editorial changes of this scroll, in common with SP, see Skehan, Ulrich and Sanderson;¹¹ Kartveit;¹² and Tov.¹³ 4QpaleoExod^m adds editorial elements in Exod 7:18; 8:19; 9:19; 10:2; 18:25; 20:19; 27:19; 30:10–27:1–3;¹⁴ 32:10.¹⁵ For a long list of reconstructed instances of added verses and rearranged sequences, see Kartveit.¹⁶ Almost all these instances refer to added

Exodus or Numbers, or if it did not appear in these books with exactly the same wording, it was repeated in the earlier books foreshadowing Deuteronomy. (2) In the story of the Ten Plagues in Exodus 7–11, the SP group balanced the description of God's commands to Moses and Aaron to warn Pharaoh before each plague with the addition of a detailed account of their execution. Systematic additions of the execution of these commands are found in SP Exodus 7–11 in contrast to the short text of MT LXX where the execution of the command is mentioned briefly.

- 11 Skehan, Ulrich, and Sanderson concluded that the scroll and SP agree in "13 typological variants, including 12 major expansions and 1 major synonymous variant" (*DJD* IX, 68–69); these authors also include similar statistics for reconstructed variants. In addition, they also list the relation between the two texts in small details: 36 agreements and 75 disagreements. The latter number is composed of the following groups: 39 unique readings of the scroll, 19 instances of 4Q = MT ≠ SP, 7 instances of 4Q = LXX ≠ SP, and 10 instances of 4Q = MT LXX ≠ SP. A close relation between the SP and 4QpaleoExod^m was recognized by Skehan at an early stage in the study of the scrolls: P.W. Skehan, "Qumran and the Present State of Old Testament Text Studies: The Masoretic Text," *JBL* 78 (1959): 21–25; idem, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the Text of the Old Testament," *BA* 28 (1965): 87–100 (98–100).
- 12 Kartveit, *Samaritans*, 310–311. The information and analysis provided by Kartveit is the most detailed, as this scholar distinguished between (A) expansions preceded and/or followed by MT, (B) "cases in which extant text is supposed to belong to an expansion or transposition on the basis of line and column calculation," and (C) reconstructed expansions. In this system, only items marked A in Kartveit's table are secure, while instances of B are reasonably certain, and instances of C are not, although some are more secured than others.
- 13 *TCHB*, 91–92.
- 14 The sequence 30:10–27:1–3, although reconstructed for the scroll, is certain, reflected also in SP. The fragments 30:10 and 27:2–3 need to be placed in one column, col. XXX, because there is no room for 30:1–10 in col. XXXV (29:34–30:18). In this column, for which both a top and a bottom margin have been preserved, there is no room in the middle for 30:1–10 which would have required 12 lines (see Skehan, Ulrich, and Sanderson, *DJD* IX, 113).
- 15 This addition is also found in manuscript 58 of the LXX.
- 16 Kartveit, *Samaritans*, 310–311

verses, while the sequence 30:10–27:1–3 reflects a different text arrangement.¹⁷ Likewise, in 4QpaleoExod^m col. 34, as in SP, Exod 29:21 follows 29:28.¹⁸

4QExod-Lev^f frg. 1 ii 5–6 (= Exod 39:21) = SP contains the execution of the command of the making of the Urim and the Thummim (Exod 28:30) not found in MT.

4QNum^b. This well-preserved scroll (including at least some words from each chapter of Numbers 14–36 except chapter 14), but written in the square script, is close to SP, and secondarily also to the LXX.¹⁹ 4QNum^b adds editorial pluses in Num 20:13b; 21:12a, 13a, 20; 27:23b, also found in SP.²⁰

The following two texts share major editorial features with the pre-Samaritan texts against MT and the other texts, and are therefore considered pre-Samaritan even though they go their own way in exegetical changes:

4QRP^a (4Q158)²¹ reflects the same editorial phenomena as SP in the following two instances: (1) Frg. 6 follows the sequence of SP: In the story of the assembly at Sinai in Exodus 20 (but not in Deuteronomy 5!), a section is added to v. 17 (= 21 MT) in SP, 4QRP^a and 4QTest (4Q175), which is seemingly unrelated to this event, viz., Deut 18:18–22: “I will raise up a prophet for them from among their own people, like yourself ...” This section was added because of the earlier verse 16 MT SP: “This is just what you asked of the LORD your God at Horeb <i.e., Sinai>,”

17 In 4QpaleoExod^m col. XXX, as in SP, the verses in which the construction of the incense altar is commanded (30:1–10 MT) come between 26:35 and 26:36–37.

18 In the scroll, 29:20 is followed by v. 22, and there is room for this verse in the next lines, after v. 21. “This sequence of instructions about the garments placing the sprinkling of the garments (v. 21) just prior to the further instructions about the garments (vv. 29–30), and furthermore it agrees with the fulfillment of the command as recorded in SP MT LXX of Lev 8:22–30” (Skehan, Ulrich, Sanderson, *DJD* 1X, 118).

19 This goes to show that the script of the Qumran scrolls is not a precondition for their proximity to SP.

20 Four additional pluses can be reconstructed in Num 12:16b; 21:22b, 23b; 31:20. See N. Jastram “27. 4QNum^b” in *DJD* XII, 205–267 (215). Among the several remarks on textual relations provided by Jastram, the most meaningful is probably that 4QNum^b SP LXX share more secondary readings than 4QNum^b MT. Among these secondary readings, shared interpolations are the most significant, five extant and four reconstructed (Jastram, *ibid.*). See also Kartveit, *Samaritans*, 311–312.

21 4QRP^a (4Q158) and 4QRP^b (4Q364), discussed next, are now considered biblical scrolls. See chapter 4 in the present volume.

on the day of the assembly, saying ...” Since there is no express mention of the “raising of the prophet,” in the story of Sinai in MT and the other sources, the common ancestor of 4QRP^a, 4QTest (4Q175), and SP deemed it necessary to add this section. (2) Like SP, 4QRP^a frg. 7 interweaves the text of Deut 5:30–31 (לֹא אֵלֶיךָ אֵלֹהִים) until לִרְשָׁתָהּ in the Sinai story of Exodus 20, after v. 18 (17) as v. 18b (17b).

4QRP^b (4Q364). This text reflects the same editorial phenomena as SP in three instances: (1) Frg. 4b–e ii presents the text of Gen 30:26–36 + add. The addition, identical with SP, presents the text of 31:11–13. In those verses, Jacob tells his wives of a dream that he had, but which had not been mentioned in the preceding verses. This presumed “oversight” led the text underlying SP and 4QRP^b (4Q364) to add the content of the dream at an earlier stage in the story, after 30:36.²² (2) The sequence Num 20:14a, 17–18 + Deut 2:8–14 is found in both SP and 4QRP^b (4Q364) 23a–b. In this remarkable instance, against the practice of the SP group, the earlier text of Numbers is added in Deuteronomy,²³ while usually the later text of Deuteronomy is added in the earlier books.²⁴ The harmonizing addition in these two sources adds the conversation with the king of Edom from Numbers 20 to the story about Moab. (3) Frg. 27 of 4QRP^b (4Q364) contains Deut 10:6–(7?), including the text of Num 33:31–37 as in SP. In this text the segment on Aaron’s death is placed in MT in v. 6, but in v. 7 in SP and probably also in 4QRP^b.²⁵

In the following case a quotation is involved:

4QTest (4Q175). The quotation from Exod 20:17 SP (= 20:21 MT) in this scroll combines two different verses of MT that are combined in SP: Deut 5:28–29 (25–26)

22 See *DJD* XIII, 193–194. A similar addition is found in SP after Gen 42:16 based on Gen 44:22.

23 In this plus, in two small details 4QRP^b agrees with SP against MT in Numbers and Deuteronomy. See *DJD* XIII, 231; 187–351, 459–463.

24 See the tables in Tov, “Rewritten Bible Compositions”; Kartveit, *Samaritans*, 310–312.

25 4QRP^c (4Q365) is not close to SP even though it exclusively agrees with another pre-Samaritan scroll and with SP in a major detail: the combination of Numbers 27 and 36 resembles that in 4QNum^b as described above. A.Y. Kim, “The Textual Alignment of the Tabernacle Sections of 4Q365 (Fragments 8a–b, 9a–b i, 9b ii, 12a i, 12b iii),” *Textus* 21 (2002): 45–69 stresses the link between 4QRP^c and MT rather than with SP. Kim limited her study to the Tabernacle sections, which is insufficient for examining the allegiance of the complete scroll. On the basis of the statistics for the complete scroll, I suggest that it is neither close to SP nor to MT. In frg. 32, 1–2 the scroll disagrees with both MT and the SP in a major detail. The scroll also agrees with MT against SP in the placement of Exod 29:21.

and 18:18–19.²⁶ The other biblical quotations in this scroll (Num 24:15–17; Deut 33:8–11) do not reflect the text of SP, but in any event in these segments SP does not reflect editorial deviations.

In sum:

The most important observation in analyzing these five biblical scrolls is that the preserved fragments of 4QpaleoExod^m (10×), 4QExod-Lev^f (1×), 4QNum^b (5×), 4QRP^a (2×), and 4QRP^b (3×) include *all* the editorial additions and rearrangements found in SP, in the exact same places. These five scrolls never lack an editorial addition of SP, while conversely in two instances 4QNum^b and 4QRP^a each contain one editorial intervention of the same type that is not found in SP:

- (1) 4QNum^b and 4QRP^c (4Q365) frg. 36, the latter not close to SP,²⁷ combine the text of Numbers 27 and 36, both dealing with the daughters of Zelophehad, into one unit in ch. 36. In the course of his rewriting, the author of 4QRP^c combined Num 27:11, probably preceded by earlier parts of the chapter, and 36:1–2, probably followed by additional verses of that chapter. The two texts were also fused, in a different way, in 4QNum^b,²⁸ and as a result, the two texts are not identical.²⁹ In the reconstructed text of 4QNum^b, the sequence is: 36:1–2, 27:2'–11'; 36:3–4; 36:1'–2'; 36:5–13. On the other hand, in 4QRP^c, the only certain evidence is that 27:11 was followed by 36:1–2.
- (2) 4QRP^a contains a narrative plus after Deut 5:31 that is not shared with the other textual witnesses, including SP, namely the implementation of the command in Deut 5:30–31.³⁰ Similar pluses are found elsewhere in the SP group.

26 See the description of 4QRP^a above, in *TCHB*, 81–82, 91, and in chapter 14 in the present volume.

27 See n. 25.

28 Col. 31 of that scroll ends with Num 36:2, while the preserved part of col. 32—missing some thirteen lines at its top—begins with 36:4. Since lines 15–16 of that column contain unknown material which runs parallel to Num 27:2, the editor of the text, Jastram, presumes that 36:1 was preceded by a large section of chapter 27 (*DJD* XII, 262–264). Even if that assumption cannot be proven, it remains correct that in the middle of the text of chapter 36 in 4QNum^b there appears an insertion from chapter 27, and the combination of these two texts runs parallel to 4QRP^c.

29 See Jastram, *DJD* XII, 263, n. 12.

30 Likewise, Zahn, *Rethinking*, 153–155 sees a similar tendency in 4QRP^a to add the execution to a command in other instances, not reflected in SP.

The upshot of the analysis so far is that five biblical scrolls and a quotation in 4QTest are closely linked with SP in the latter's characteristic readings that go beyond scribal activity in small details. All these sources display editorial intervention that is secondary when compared with the MT-group and the LXX. These sources display a wish to perfect the text of Scripture without adding new elements. Some scholars name this activity harmonization, but I distinguish between the two phenomena. These five scrolls do not represent a large group of scrolls among the 46 scrolls of the Torah that are sufficiently extensive for analysis, but the scrolls that are exclusively close to SP still comprise 11 % of the Torah scrolls, which is a sizable number. On the other hand, C. Hiltunen thinks in terms of anywhere between 6 % (3 texts) and 25 % (13 texts).³¹

1.2 *Harmonizations*

The improving of the text at a lower, textual, level is visible in so-called harmonizations included in the SP group, but not only in them. Scribes adapted many elements in the text to other details in the same verse, in the immediate or a similar context, in the same book and in parallel sections elsewhere in Scripture. This phenomenon is termed harmonizing (by most scholars) or analogy by Koenig.³² Among the known texts, harmonizations in small details are especially frequent in the *Vorlage* of the LXX in the Torah and in the SP group,³³ although scholars usually connect this phenomenon only with SP. The main stumbling block in this analysis is the fragmentary nature of the Qumran scrolls, which complicates statistical analysis. The first stage of the analysis counts the number of harmonizations from the angle of the pre-Samaritan texts. *No diacritics* are used in the recording of these examples.

1.2.1 4QpaleoExod^m

4Q SP ≠ MT LXX (5×)

31 See her presentation at the SBL meeting in Rome (2009) based on her M.A. thesis: C.L. Hiltunen "An Examination of the Supposed pre-Samaritan Scrolls from Qumran," M.A. Thesis, Trinity Western University 2009. Scrolls included in this group are 4QGen^c, 4QGen^{d,e}, 1QpaleoLev, 4QLev^{c, e, d}, the Leviticus section of 4QLev-Num^a, 4QDeut^{e, f}, 4QpaleoDeut^f.

32 J. Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique du judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe* (VTSup 33; Leiden: Brill, 1982).

33 See n. 56.

8:20 כבד MT SP LXX] 4Q SP + מאד cf. 9:3, 18, 24
 10:5 כל MT SP LXX] 4Q SP + כל פרי cf. v. 15
 10:24 ולאהרון MT] 4Q SP LXX +
 24:1, 9 ואביהוא MT SP LXX] 4Q SP + ואיתמר cf. 6:23; 28:1
 27:19 נחשת MT SP LXX] 4Q SP + לשרת שני ותולעת cf. 39:1
 27:19 נחשת MT SP LXX] 4Q SP + לשרת שני ותולעת cf. 39:1

SP ≠ 4Q MT (2×)

6:27 ממצרים MT 4Q LXX] SP מארץ מצרים cf. *passim*
 6:30 ישמע אלי MT 4Q] SP ישמעני cf. 6:12

LXX ≠ 4Q MT SP (6×)

9:8 פרעה MT 4Q SP] LXX + καὶ ἐναντίον τῶν θεραπόντων αὐτοῦ cf. 7:10
 עבדיו
 9:9 אבעבעות פרח MT 4Q SP] LXX ἑλκη φλυκτίδες ἀναζέουσai cf. v. 10
 שחין אבעבעת פרח
 9:9 בכל MT 4Q SP] LXX pr. καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἐν τοῖς τετράποσιν
 cf. v. 9a על האדם ועל הבהמה
 19:10 אל העם MT 4Q SP] LXX καταβάς διαμάρτυραι τῷ λαῷ cf. v. 21
 העד בעם
 32:7 לך רד MT SP; 4Q] LXX + τὸ τάχος ἐντεῦθεν cf. Deut 9:12
 32:13 כוכבי השמים MT 4Q SP] LXX + τῷ πλῆθει cf. Deut 1:10; 10:22; 28:62
 לרב

MT LXX ≠ 4Q SP (1×)

29:2 מוצת MT LXX 4Q SP] MT LXX + משחים בשמן cf. Lev 2:4; 7:12

MT SP LXX ≠ 4Q (1×)

34:1b 4Q] MT SP LXX + הראשנים cf. v. 1a

MT 4Q SP ≠ LXX (3×)

25:33 ופרח LXX] MT 4Q SP + ופרח כפתר ופרח cf. 37:19
 28:11 ישראל LXX] MT 4Q SP + ותם תעשה אותם cf. 39:9
 34:2b ועלית LXX] MT 4Q SP + בבקר cf. v. 2a

The sum total of the harmonizations in the sections covered by 4QpaleoExod^m is: SP 12×, LXX 9×, 4QpaleoExod^m 8×, MT 5×.

1.2.2 4QExod-Lev^f

4Q alone (2×)

Exod 39:21 האפוד 2⁰ MT SP LXX] 4Q + ביתה cf. v. 19 and Exod 28:26

Exod 40:18 קרשיו ואת MT 4Q SP LXX] 4Q pr ואת קרסיו cf. 35:11 ואת
קרשיו את בריחו

MT SP ≠ LXX 4Q (1×)

Exod 40:22 מועד באהל (ויתן את השולחן) אל אהל מועד in LXX 4Q] MT SP מועד
באהל מועד cf. vv. 24, 26

4Q SP ≠ MT LXX (2×)

39:21a האפד 1⁰ MT 4Q SP LXX] 4Q SP + את משה cf. v. 21b.

Beyond v. 21b, where this phrase is found in all sources, it is found 8 times elsewhere in chapter 39, more than in any other chapter in Scripture. Exodus 40 (7×) and Leviticus 8 (altogether 6×) come close.

Exod 40:27 סמים MT LXX] 4Q + לפני יהוה; SP + לפני יהוה cf. v. 25 and 29:25; 30:8

MT 4Q SP ≠ LXX (2×)

Exod 40:11 init LXX] + וקדשת אותו MT 4Q SP cf.

Lev 8:11 לקדשם ואת הכיור ואת כליו ואת המזבח ואת כל כליי

Exod 40:24 מועד LXX] MT 4Q SP + נבח השלחן cf. 26:35

4Q SP LXX ≠ MT (2×)

Exod 40:17 בשנה השנית MT 4Q SP LXX] 4Q SP LXX + מצרים cf. 16:1
לחדש השני לצאתם מארץ מצרים

Lev 2:1 לבונה MT 4Q SP LXX] 4Q SP LXX + היא cf. 6:15

MT SP LXX ≠ 4Q (1×)

Exod 40:20 הארן על הכפרת] MT SP LXX + מלמעלה cf. 25:21 את
הכפרת מלמעלה על הארון

The sum total of the harmonizations in the sections covered by 4QExod-Lev^f is: 4Q 8×, SP 6×, MT 4×, LXX 3×.³⁴

1.2.3 4QNum^b

4Q alone (8×)

20:20 לא תעבר בי v. 18 cf. MT SP LXX] 4Q + בחרב אצא לקראתכה + לא תעבר MT. The words לא תעבר בי in v. 20 triggered the addition from v. 18 in 4Q.

22:16 בלק בן צפר מלך מואב cf. v. 10 MT SP LXX] 4Q + בלק בן צפור
22:19 וישבו שרי מואב עם בלעם cf. v. 8 MT SP LXX] 4Q + מה יסף יהוה דבר עמי
כאשר ידבר יהוה אלי וישבו שרי מואב עם בלעם

22:32 בדרך לשטן לו v. 22 cf. MT; לשטן SP] 4Q [לכה
23:3 התיצב כה על v. 15 cf. MT SP LXX] 4Q ואנוכי אלך (התיצב על עלתך) ואלכה
עלתך ואנוכי

24:9 כרע רבץ כרע רבץ באריה 4Q SP-ms MT SP] 4Q כרע שכם כארי
כאריה

26:10 חמשים cf. 16:35 [מקריבי הקטן] רת + 4Q MT SP LXX] חמשים ומאתים
ומאתים איש מקריבי הקטרת

27:22 יהושע MT SP LXX] 4Q + בן נון cf. 27:18 and *passim*

4Q LXX ≠ MT SP (5×)

22:11 לאמר הנה עם יצא ממצרים (v. 10) cf. v. 5 MT (SP LXX)] 4Q LXX pr לאמר הנה עם יצא ממצרים

22:11 הנה v. 5 cf. MT SP (LXX)] 4Q LXX + מומלי ויהוה יושב ממלי
כסה את עין הארץ והוא יושב ממלי

22:11 ואגרשנו מן הארץ v. 6 cf. MT SP LXX] 4Q LXX + מן הארץ] וגרשתי

22:18 לעשות טובה 24:13 cf. MT SP LXX] 4Q LXX + בלבי
או רעה מלבי

26:33 ואלה שמות בנתיו 27:1 cf. MT SP] 4Q LXX שמות ושמ בנות צלפחד

4Q SP LXX ≠ MT (1×)

22:11 הנה עם יצא MT] 4Q SP LXX = v. 5

34 Apparently harmonization is a much more influential source for changes between the textual witnesses than textual corruption. Thus F.M. Cross, *DJD* XII, 133–144 (136).

4Q MT ≠ SP (1×)

23:30 אל המזבח SP] 4Q MT במזבח cf. vv. 2, 4, 14

Different harmonizations? (1×)

22:33 הרגתי MT 4Q LXX cf. v. 29] SP הכיתי cf. vv. 23, 25, 27, 28, 32

The sum total of the harmonizations in the sections covered by 4QNum^b is: 4QNum^b 15×, LXX 6×, SP 1×, MT 1×. The amount of harmonization in 4QNum^b is thus very striking.

Our analysis also includes the following pre-Samaritan text that shares much with the other pre-Samaritan texts, yet includes more exegetical details than the first three texts, and hence differs more from SP:

1.2.4 4QRP^b (4Q364)

4QRP^b alone (10×)

Gen 25:19 יצחק MT SP LXX] 4Q + אשר ילדה לו שרה אשתו cf. v. 12 אשר ילדה
הגר המצרית שפחת שרה לאברהם

Gen 30:26 עבדתך MT [4Q] SP LXX] 4Q + ארבעה עשרה שנה cf. 31:41 עבדתך
ארבע עשרה שנה

Gen 30:33 כל MT 4Q SP LXX] 4Q + כל cf. v. 32 כל

Gen 31:52a המצבה MT 4Q SP LXX] 4Q LXX + הזואת cf. v. 52b

Deut 2:34b לא השארנו MT 4Q SP LXX] 4Q pr החרמנו cf. v. 34a ונחרם

Deut 2:36 יהוה MT 4Q SP LXX] 4Q + אלהינו לפנינו cf. v. 33 ויתנהו יהוה אלהינו
לפנינו

Deut 3:1a הבשן MT 4Q SP LXX] 4Q + למלחמה cf. v. 1b

Deut 3:2a אתו MT 4Q SP LXX] 4Q + ואת כול עמו cf. v. 2b

Deut 11:7 עשה MT 4Q SP LXX] 4Q + לעיניכם cf. 1:30; LXX + ὡς ᾠκον

Deut 11:8 היום MT 4Q SP LXX] 4Q + ואת בנימכה תצווה cf. Deut 32:46 היום
אשר תצום את בניכם

MT SP LXX ≠ 4Q (5×)

Gen 25:20 לבן in 4Q] MT SP LXX cf. 28:5; 31:20, 24

Gen 25:20 לאשה in 4Q] MT SP LXX pr ותהיה cf. 20:12; 24:67 and
passim

Gen 26:7 המקום MT 4Q SP LXX] MT SP LXX + ואשתו ויאמר אחתי הוא
 cf. 26:9 ואיך אמרת אחתי הוא
 Deut 2:32 למלחמה MT 4Q SP LXX] MT SP LXX + יהצה cf. Num 21:23 ויבא
 יהצה וילחם בישראל
 Deut 3:1 ונעלה MT 4Q SP LXX] MT SP (ונפנה) LXX + ונפן cf. Num 21:33;
 Deut 1:24

LXX ≠ MT 4Q SP (2×)

Gen 25:21 אשתו MT 4Q SP] LXX pr רבקה cf. 26:8 רבקה אשתו
 Gen 35:28 יצחק MT 4Q LXX] LXX + אשר חי cf. 25:7 אברהם חי
 אשר חי

The sum total of the harmonizations in the sections covered by 4QRP^b is: 4QRP^b 10×; LXX 7×; MT 5×; SP 5×.

Summary: Harmonizations in the Pre-Samaritan Texts Compared with Other Texts

	Scroll	SP	LXX	MT
4QpaleoExod ^m	8	12	9	5
4QExod-Lev ^f	8	6	3	4
4QNum ^b	15	1	6	1
4QRP ^a (4Q158)	0	0	0	0
4QRP ^b (4Q364)	10	5	7	5

Several studies (see n. 54) suggest independently that the largest amount of harmonization in the known textual sources of Hebrew Scripture is found in the LXX, followed by the SP (in this calculation, the editorial changes discussed in § 1.1 above are disregarded). These studies did not include the pre-Samaritan scrolls that are for the first time incorporated in the present study. From our new analysis it now appears that three scrolls (4QExod-Lev^f, 4QNum^b, 4QRP^b) contain the greatest amount of harmonization, while for the material covered by 4QpaleoExod^m, SP contains the largest amount. In any event, these scrolls, SP, and the LXX remain major sources for harmonization, as opposed to MT, where this feature occurs much less frequently. This issue is further pursued below with regard to the LXX.

Coincidence plays a part in the analysis of the fragmentary scrolls since harmonizations do not occur in the same frequency in all chapters. For example, in the fragments of 4QRP^a no cases of harmonization are spotted. At the same time, this analysis has shown that the pre-Samaritan scrolls resemble SP and the LXX in the frequency of harmonization and hence could belong to the same group or tradition.

On the other hand, with respect to orthography (see § 1.3 below), insufficient information is available for making a firm connection between SP and the pre-Samaritan texts.

1.3 *Orthography*

Usually the orthography of the medieval representatives of SP is fuller than that of MT, although not greatly so. On the other hand, most pre-Samaritan texts are fuller than both SP and MT.³⁵ The two subgroups of the SP group thus behaved differently in orthography. Although the pre-Samaritan texts from Qumran are more than one thousand years older than the medieval manuscripts of SP, the somewhat more defective spelling of the medieval copies reflects a typologically earlier stage in the development of the Samaritan text. Apparently, the medieval copies of SP derive from a copy or tradition that is older or less doctored than the copies found at Qumran.

2 The SP and the Pre-Samaritan Scrolls: Synthesis

SP and the pre-Samaritan scrolls resemble each other in three central issues:

- i. They exclusively share the same editorial interventions at the exact same places. In this feature they are almost identical, but not completely, since two pre-Samaritan scrolls display one instance each of such an editorial intervention that is not shared with SP (4QRP^a contains a narrative plus after Deut 5:31 not shared with the other texts and 4QNum^b combines two Scripture texts unlike the other texts).
- ii. They share a tendency to harmonize small details, but not exclusively, since the LXX harmonizes as well, sometimes more so.

35 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QExod-Lev^f are somewhat fuller than the medieval text of SP and MT, while 4QNum^b, reflecting the spelling of the Qumran scribal practice, is much fuller. For details, see the mentioned text editions in the *DJD* series. The full spelling of the pre-Samaritan texts does not follow any specific pattern.

- iii. The members of the SP group share some characteristic readings, such as easier readings, but these agreements are not significant.

The members of the SP group also differ among each other:

- i. The pre-Samaritan texts do not share the ideological Samaritan readings.³⁶
- ii. The various texts differ often in small details, to be illustrated below.
- iii. Most pre-Samaritan texts display a fuller orthography than both SP and MT.
- iv. 4QRP^a and 4QRP^b deviate from the other pre-Samaritan texts in their exegetical changes.

We now turn to the overall statistical pattern of the relations between the pre-Samaritan texts and SP, focusing on *small* differences, including the harmonizations and disregarding the large differences. The general conclusion of this investigation is that the members of the SP group, while sharing important features, often differ from each other in small details. Orthographical differences and reconstructions are disregarded.

2.1 4QpaleoExod^m

4Q = SP (= MT and/or LXX) 60

4Q = SP (≠ MT and LXX) 7

4Q ≠ SP (4Q agrees with MT and/or LXX) 47

4Q unique readings 16³⁷

4Q thus agrees with SP 67×, of which 7 times in exclusive agreements.

4Q disagrees with SP 63 times, including 16 unique readings in the former.

In small details 4Q thus agrees as much with SP as it disagrees, but the major agreements are in the large editorial differences mentioned in section 1.1 above.³⁸

³⁶ For the latter, see *TCHB*, 87–88.

³⁷ J.E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4QpaleoExod^m and the Samaritan Tradition* (HSS 8; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1986), 158–160 gives a higher figure for the unique readings of 4QpaleoExod^m (27×).

³⁸ Within these large expansions, the two also differ in 8 details (Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll*, 214–220).

2.2 4QExod-Lev^f

4Q = SP (≠ MT and/or LXX) 7

4Q ≠ SP (4Q agrees with MT and/or LXX) 5

4Q unique readings 13

Since the unique readings of 4QExod-Lev^f include differences between the scroll and the SP, the two differ more than they agree in small matters, while in the large differences, they agree in one central detail.

2.3 4QNum^b

4Q = SP (≠ MT and/or LXX) 59

4Q ≠ SP (4Q agrees with MT and/or LXX) 63

4Q unique readings 52

Since the unique readings of 4QNum^b also indicate disagreement with SP, the number of such disagreements (63 + 52 = 115) is much larger than that of their agreements (59). The amount of agreement of the scroll with SP is larger in the calculation of Jastram, *DJD* XI, 213–215, but we do not know how he reached these figures.³⁹

2.4 4QRP^a (4Q158)

4QRP^a = SP (≠ MT and/or LXX) 8

4QRP^a ≠ SP 9

4QRP^a unique readings 9

39 "For the preserved variants, according to one method of counting the correlations between the witnesses, 4QNum^b agrees with SP in c. 42 %, with MT in c. 37 %, with LXX in c. 35 %, and with no other witness in c. 28 %." Jastram probably included all the variants in the large editorial changes, otherwise he would not have reached such a high number of agreement with SP. In our calculation these cases are disregarded, although obviously they weigh very heavily in calculating the relation between the sources. Jastram adds: "If the variants are weighed, however, rather than merely counted, it becomes clearer that 4QNum^b SP LXX share more significant *secondary* <my italics, E. T.> readings than 4QNum^b MT, and thus are more closely related. Of the secondary readings in 4QNum^b, the most significant are the major interpolations shared with SP" (*DJD* XI, 215). Jastram's analysis was continued in a significant study, "A Comparison of two 'proto-Samaritan' Texts from Qumran: 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QNum^b," *DSD* 5 (1998): 264–289.

4QRP^a agrees with SP in major details, but in the small details it often disagrees with SP, as well as with MT and LXX. 4QRP^a differs from the other texts of 4QRP in that it contains more exegetical elements, making it likely that some of these mentioned disagreements with SP, MT and LXX have to be ascribed to the same exegetical tendencies. There are no instances of harmonizations in small details.

2.5 4QRP^b (4Q364)

4QRP^b = SP (≠ MT and/or LXX) 25 of which 7 exclusive connections with SP
4QRP^b ≠ SP 37
4QRP^b unique readings 22
4QRP^b disagrees more with SP (59) than it agrees with that text (25).
Some of the unique readings must be ascribed to rewriting of 4QRP^b, prominent in the other manuscripts of 4QRP as well.⁴⁰

Summary: Relations in Small Details between the Sources

				2 + 3
	1. Scroll = SP	2. Scroll ≠ SP	3. Scroll unique	combined
4QpaleoExod ^m	67	47	16	63
4QExod-Lev ^f	7	5	13	18
4QNum ^b	59	63	52	115
4QRP ^a (4Q158)	8	9	9	18
4QRP ^b (4Q364)	25	37	22	59

The upshot of the analysis is that in addition to the major agreements between the scrolls in editorial readings, they often differ in small details.

40 4QDeutⁿ is excluded from the analysis. At an earlier stage of research, this scroll was believed to be pre-Samaritan, but this assumption was refuted by E. Owen, "4QDeutⁿ: A Pre-Samaritan Text?" *DSD* 4 (1997): 162–178.

Analysis

Before the discoveries at Qumran, scholars conceived of the medieval manuscripts of SP as reflections of an ancient text, whose nature could not be easily determined. This situation has changed since the discovery at Qumran of texts that are very close to SP in significant details. These texts probably preceded the creation of SP, and they are now called pre-Samaritan on the assumption that one of them was adapted to suit the views of the Samaritans and subsequently served as their Scripture. The use of the term *pre-Samaritan* is thus based on the assumption that while the connections between SP and the pre-Samaritan texts are exclusive, they reflect different realities. The pre-Samaritan texts are *not* Samaritan documents, as they lack the specifically Samaritan readings, while sharing with SP its major features.

Little can be said with certainty about the internal relation between the pre-Samaritan texts. Their agreement in idiosyncratic features would indicate a single common text that was subsequently developed in the various manuscripts.⁴¹ Since each text behaves differently in small details, the input of individual scribes must have been substantial.⁴² For example, while 4QpaleoExod^m reflects the same amount of editorial interventions as SP, 4QNum^b has slightly more. However, in spite of these differences, the editorial and most of the harmonizing small changes common to the above-mentioned texts are exclusive and hence they form a distinct group.

To call these texts merely “harmonistic”⁴³ and not pre-Samaritan is insightful, but does not do justice to their major features. These texts are characterized

41 Alternatively, scribes independently produced copies of the biblical text reflecting the same editorial-scribal tendencies. However, the high degree of agreement between the pre-Samaritan texts does not support such an assumption.

42 See Zahn, *Rethinking*, 136–137: “In examining the SP text tradition as a potential source of analogues to the type of reworking that we have seen in the 4QRP MSS, we must take seriously the extensive evidence for its gradual development over time; that is, the likelihood that all its unique features did not come about at the same time. As I will indicate below, most of the largest changes in SP and the pre-SP MSS appear to accomplish a very specific goal, and may therefore be the product of a single redactor. On the other hand, some modifications of different types are absent from the pre-SP MSS; others occur in a pre-SP MS but not in SP; and others are also found in G (probably indicating that they originated prior to the insertion of the major, characteristic changes in the SP text tradition). Thus I do not treat SP and its forebears as witnesses to the compositional techniques of a single scribe, but rather as witnesses to the compositional techniques that were used by a variety of Second Temple scribes in the course of the Pentateuch’s transmission over a period of many years.”

43 Thus Eshel, “4QDeut” (p. 121). This is a very significant paper in which the author develops

by freedom towards their underlying text, which comes to light in major editorial changes, as well as in small harmonizing changes (mainly pluses). Harmonizing pluses characterize not only SP, but even more so LXX-Torah, making it impossible to name only the SP group harmonistic. More realistic is a term used by S.W. Crawford, “harmonistic/expansive.”⁴⁴

In my view the SP group formed a popular group of texts in ancient Israel.⁴⁵ Some scholars name these texts “Palestinian”⁴⁶ since they are not evidenced outside Palestine, but this term implies that no other groups of texts were extant in Palestine. S.W. Crawford argues that this scribal group was part of a priestly/Levitical exegetical tradition.⁴⁷ She identifies Jerusalem and the sanctuary at Mount Gerizim as the centers where these texts were produced.⁴⁸ I am not sure we can be as specific as this, and would rather think that beyond MT, this text was the major popular text used in Palestine, with close ties to the ancestor of the LXX, although the one-sided information from Qumran does not show the extent of its popularity. Beyond the copies of this text quoted above, this popularity comes to light in the quotations from this text in 4QTest, 4QComm Gen A (4Q252), and the author of Jubilees.⁴⁹ Furthermore, the fact that two of the exegetical texts previously named 4QRP, namely 4QRP^a (4Q158) and 4QRP^b (4Q364) reflect this text, shows its wide diffusion.

If indeed the pre-Samaritan texts were popular, it is not surprising that the Samaritan community chose a so-called pre-Samaritan text as the basis for

her view that there were many texts that were “harmonistic”: biblical scrolls, “biblical scrolls with apocryphal additions,” and *tefillin* and *mezuzot*. Among these biblical texts, Eshel included not only the pre-Samaritan texts, but also 4QDeutⁿ.

44 S.W. Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 23–35; eadem, “The Pentateuch as Found in the pre-Samaritan Texts and 4QReworked Pentateuch,” in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period* (ed. H. von Weissenberg et al.; BZAW 419; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 123–136: “I would argue that the harmonistic/expansive text-type is not an accident in the Qumran collection, but part of the Qumran community’s repertoire of Pentateuch texts used for scripture study (e.g. 4QDeutⁿ), prayer (e.g. the phylacteries), and exegesis (e.g. 4QTestimonia)” (ibid., 125).

45 See *TCHB*, 91.

46 F.M. Cross, *DJD* XI, 136.

47 S.W. Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 146–149.

48 “The Pentateuch as Found,” 125–128.

49 According to J.C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), 137, *Jubilees* especially reflects readings of SP and the LXX, texts that were “at home in Palestine.”

its Scripture in all five Torah books.⁵⁰ Neither the proto-Masoretic text, often associated with the Temple circles, nor the text underlying the LXX was chosen for this purpose.

3 The SP Group and the LXX

The description of the pre-Samaritan texts and the SP becomes more complicated when the LXX is included in this analysis. The major complication is created by the fact that the small harmonizations are evidenced more frequently in LXX-Torah than in SP, often two or three times as much. This fact alone would warrant the assumption of a special connection between the SP group and the LXX. The closeness between these two entities has been recognized long ago in scholarship, creating a variety of strange theories. Thus it was suggested in the seventeenth and eighteenth century that the LXX was translated from SP,⁵¹ or that SP was revised according to the LXX, or, conversely, that the LXX was revised according to SP.⁵² These and other theories show the limitations of an approach that was bound by the assumption of a tripartite or bipartite division of the textual witnesses of the Bible. The truth of the matter is that possibly in the pedigree of the biblical text, these two texts were closer to each other than to MT, in the Torah. We need not speak about other books, since there was no Samaritan version of these books.⁵³

Continuing with the facts themselves, the number of the harmonizations of the LXX is very high, higher than in SP. In the following calculation, the pre-Samaritan scrolls are disregarded because of their fragmentary status, focusing instead on MT-SP-LXX. In this triad, MT has few harmonizations, the LXX has many, and the SP has less, but still many.

⁵⁰ According to S.W. Crawford, "The Pentateuch as Found," 131, "plausible ... that the north-erners did not simply accept a version of the Pentateuch from the southerners but used a text-type with which they were familiar, and may have had some role in developing."

⁵¹ Thus Louis de Dieu, John Selden(us), Johan H. Hottinger(us), and Johan Hassencamp(ius); for a detailed description of their views and bibliographical references, see W. Gesenius, *Pent. Sam.*, 11. See also the study quoted in n. 56.

⁵² Thus Hugo Grotius and James Usserius. See Gesenius, *ibid.*, 13.

⁵³ I do not know whether the number of the disagreements between SP and the LXX is significant. More important is the nature of their agreements. Against the traditional number of 1,900 agreements between the two, K.-R. Kim, *Studies* counts merely 964 (of which 493 are meaningful, and of these 493, 328 are common harmonizations).

Previous research on the harmonizations in the LXX focused on great parts of the Torah.⁵⁴ Most of these harmonizations appear in the narrative sections, while some pertain to the phraseology of the laws. In very few cases, the content of a law is harmonized with a parallel one, as in LXX-Deut 16:7 adapted to Exod 12:8.

The harmonizations for Genesis 1–11 are listed as follows in chapter 31:

SP LXX ≠ MT 11

SP MT ≠ LXX 11

SP ≠ MT LXX 9

LXX ≠ MT SP 52.

Summary of the harmonizations in the three sources:

LXX 63

SP 31

MT 11.

The data for Genesis 12–50 are listed as follows in chapter 12:

LXX ≠ MT SP (145)

SP LXX ≠ MT (53)

SP ≠ MT LXX (31)

MT SP ≠ LXX (36).

One notes a large number of harmonization in the LXX alone, and a reasonably large number of shared harmonization of LXX and SP. The sum total of the harmonizations in the three sources is:

54 For the data, see Hendel, *Genesis 1–11* and chapters 12 and 31 in the present volume. See further M. Rösel, “Die Septuaginta und der Kult: Interpretationen und Aktualisierungen im Buche Numeri,” in *La double transmission du texte biblique: Hommage à A. Schenker* (ed. Y. Goldman & C. Uehlinger; OBO 179; Fribourg/Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 25–40 (29–39) and G. Dorival, *La Bible d’Alexandrie, 4: Les Nombres* (Paris: Cerf, 1994) 42–43; idem, “Les phénomènes d’intertextualité dans le livre grec des Nombres,” in *Κατὰ τοὺς Ο΄, Selon les Septante: Trente études sur la Bible grecque des Septante en hommage à Marguerite Harl* (ed. G. Dorival & O. Munnich; Paris: Cerf, 1995), 261–285. Both scholars discuss several examples of harmonization in LXX-Numbers, without statistics, and with the clear implication that this was an inner-Septuagintal phenomenon.

LXX 198

SP 120

MT 36.

The data for Deuteronomy are listed as follows by Tov:⁵⁵

MT SP ≠ LXX 44

LXX ≠ MT SP 99

SP LXX ≠ MT 27

SP ≠ MT LXX 22

MT ≠ SP LXX 2

MT LXX ≠ SP 8.

The combined figures for the individual witnesses of Deuteronomy are:

LXX 134

SP 93

MT 54.

Although the analysis is subjective, the figures point in the same direction: a small number of harmonization in MT, a large number in SP, and twice as much in the LXX. Because of their fragmentary status, the situation of the scrolls is unclear, but they are probably close to that of SP.

For a few examples in Genesis, see:

17:14 MT SP LXX בשר את ימול את בשר ערלתו; SP LXX + ביום השמיני (τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ὀγδόῃ). Based on Lev 12:3 MT SP LXX.

12:20 MT SP LXX וכל אשר לו ואת אשתו וכל אשר לו; SP LXX + ולוט עמו (καὶ Λώτ μετ' αὐτοῦ). Based on 13:1 MT SP LXX עמו ולוט עמו.

20:14 MT SP LXX ושפחת ועבדים וצאן ובקר; SP LXX + אלף כסף (χίλια δίδραχμα καὶ), inserted at the "+" sign. Based on v. 16 MT SP LXX.

4 Conclusions

A certain amount of proximity is visible between SP, the pre-Samaritan texts, and the LXX, but it is not easy to make precise statements on this relation

55 Tov, "Textual Harmonizations Deuteronomy."

since not all aspects of these relations have been researched yet. Nevertheless, some details can now be clarified, even though we should remember that only some of the texts circulating in early centuries have been preserved. Parts of the puzzle can be resolved, and indications for a stemma may be gathered:

1. MT stands apart from SP, the pre-Samaritan texts, and the LXX.
2. SP and the pre-Samaritan texts form a firm sub-group probably going back to a single hyparchetype, changed in each individual source.
3. The LXX is closely related to the SP group, but not by way of revision of the SP to the LXX, as was once thought (see n. 52). Rather, in the harmonizations they reflect the same secondary/inferior text, while it is hard to determine whether the LXX or the SP group reflects a better version of the earlier text. In my view, the LXX in the Torah does not reflect the same quality text as in most other books of the LXX, but this issue needs to be studied further.⁵⁶

56 See chapter 16 in the present volume and my forthcoming study "The Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch."

PART 3

Septuagint



Personal Names in the Septuagint of Isaiah¹

This study deals with the representation of personal names in the LXX of Isaiah. It focuses on the translational, exegetical, and linguistic aspects of these names, not on the phonetic representation of the Hebrew. These names involve both personal and geographic names.² Our focus is the LXX of Isaiah, but this area cannot be separated from the other LXX books nor from the exegesis of the LXX of Isaiah in general, an area to which the honoree devoted many studies.³

Personal names are usually transliterated, even if they consist of two Hebrew components. As a rule, both constituents of such compound names were transliterated (e.g. “house of ...”, “mountain of ...”),⁴ but sometimes their first element was translated. In other cases both constituents were translated.⁵

Translators constantly struggle with the question as to what constitutes a personal name, usually to be transliterated. For example, in the case of Isa 8:1, 3, modern translations present a transliteration: The Lord said to me, “Get yourself a large sheet and write on it in common script ‘For Maher-shalal-hash-baz’ ... and the Lord said to me, “Name him Maher-shalal-hash-baz” (*NJPS*, all other translations similarly). However, the LXX translated these words (“... Then the Lord said to me, Name him ‘Swiftly Spoil, Quickly Plunder’”).

With a computer-assisted search⁶ of the LXX (based on Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*⁷), I located 27.413 occurrences of proper names in 10.912 verses in the canonical books of the LXX, with and without Greek endings. For Isaiah, these figures are

1 Translations of Hebrew Scripture follow the *NJPS*, and translations of the LXX follow *NETS*.

2 The study of geographic names in the LXX is somewhat neglected in the literature (see n. 22 for an early study). Thus, Dogniez, *Bibliography* does not include a section devoted to this topic. On the other hand, the earlier Brock, *Bibliography* contains sections on “proper names,” “onomastica,” and “transliterations.”

3 See among others, A. van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (OBO 35; Freiburg/Göttingen, 1981); idem, *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah XXII as Version and Vision* (VTSup 71; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 1998).

4 For example, Εμεξαχωρ in Josh 7:24 (עמק עכור), ἐν Ἀραβωθ Ἰεριχώ in 2 Kgs 25:5 (בערבות ירחו).

5 For examples, see N. Fernández Marcos, “Nombres propios y etimologías populares en la Septuaginta,” *Sefarad* 37 (1977): 239–259.

6 The search was performed with the aid of the *Accordance* computer program version 7.4.

7 The text of this edition hardly differs from that of the volumes of the Göttingen Septuagint, while the apparatuses of variants differ completely.

724 occurrences of proper nouns in 387 verses. When multiple occurrences of the names in the LXX are disregarded, we are left with 3544 different forms of personal names in the LXX (186 in Isaiah) representing a smaller number of names since many Hebrew names are represented by several different forms.⁸ Among these 3544 different forms, words with a Hellenized ending in -ος, -ας, -ης, -ινη, -ψ, -ις, and -α, account for an average 31% of the occurrences of the proper names in the LXX (see below).⁹ Our analysis refers to the figure that disregards the multiple occurrences of words, since frequently occurring names distort the statistics.

1 Hellenized Endings¹⁰

Most names are transliterated into Greek without the characteristic case endings of Greek words. Thus, the first verse of Isaiah contains four indeclinable personal names: Αμως, Ιερουσαλημ, Ιωαθαμ, Αχαζ. One of these, Αμως, has a Greek ending,¹¹ but is not declinable. At the same time, four other words in that verse have Greek endings and are declinable: Ησαίας, Οζίου (nom. Οζίας), Εζεχίου (nom. Εζεχίας), Ιουδαίας (nom. Ιουδαία). According to Thackeray,¹² most names of places and peoples reflect their Hellenized forms,¹³ with a minority representing transliterated nouns without Greek endings. However, in view of the long lists of transliterated personal names in Genesis, Joshua, and Chronicles that represent their *Vorlagen* exactly with non-Greek endings, this view is

8 For example, the different representations of Kittim are counted separately: Κιτιάιοι, Κιτιείς, Χεττιμ, Χεττιν, Ψωμαίοι (see below).

9 All statistics are approximate only. I did not count as Hellenized the ending -ων (reflecting Hebrew words ending with ו-) since most words ending with these letters are indeclinable. Further, we did include words ending with -α that represent Aramaic nouns ending with *aleph* although they are not declinable.

10 The accents and breathings of the Greek words follow the (*inconsistent*) conventions of the Göttingen Septuagint.

11 Cf. Εἰλως, Εἰλωτος (a Helot, name of the Spartan serfs); εἰδώς participle of οἶδα, etc.

12 Thackeray, *Grammar*, 160–171.

13 Thackeray, *Grammar*, 166: "... Here <i.e., places and peoples>, however, the Hellenized forms largely predominate. The translators, for the most part, had a fair knowledge of the geography, not only of Egypt, but also of other countries, and adopted the current Hellenized forms." In n. 7, Thackeray lists the following examples: Αἰθιοπία, Ἀντιλίβανος, Ἰόπη, Καππαδοκία (for Kaphtor), Καρχηδών, Μεσποταμία, Συρία. Thackeray, *Grammar*, 167 further notes: "Rarely, apart from the later historical books, do we find places of importance like Damascus or Tyre transliterated."

very unlikely. Thackeray's view can now be refuted by computer-assisted data.¹⁴ Thus, according to our statistics, 41 % of the proper names in Isaiah have Hellenized endings, a sizeable number, but still a minority.¹⁵ These statistics imply that most proper names in the LXX represent the Hebrew/Aramaic words as such including some Hebrew/Aramaic morphemes.¹⁶ The numbers of Hellenized endings in Isaiah, as in the other Prophetic books, are higher by 10 percent than most LXX books probably because the Prophets contain a greater percentage of geographic names (places, regions, people) than, for example, the historical books. In geographic names, the translators more readily added Greek endings. Similar percentages of Greek endings, usually approximately 30 %, pertain to the LXX as a whole. On the other hand, the later biblical books of Esther, Daniel, and 1 Esdras and the deuterocanonical books contain a larger number of Hellenized names than the earlier ones. In Esther and Daniel, the 61 % and 46 % respectively of such Hellenized names are either the majority or a very sizeable group.¹⁷ For these books, Thackeray's statements are correct. Likewise, Josephus always reflects the Hellenized forms of biblical names, while Jewish Greek papyri from Egypt reflect both Semitic and Hellenized forms.¹⁸

14 For the basis of these searches, see n. 6. The statistics refer only to nouns, and not to adjectives, such as "Moabite" in Ῥουθ ἡ Μωαβίτις (Ruth 1:22) and an "Egyptian maidservant," παιδίσκη Αἰγυπτία (Gen 16:1). Almost all these adjectives have Greek endings.

15 Of a total of 724 occurrences of words classified as proper names, 289 end in -ος, -ας, -ης, -ων, -ψ, -ις, and -α (40 %). If we focus on the individual words occurring multiple times in the LXX of Isaiah (168), we note that 69 of them (41 %) have Hellenized endings. Troxel presents different statistical data. According to the calculation of this scholar, 79.9 % of the 538 toponyms in that book have been transliterated in their Hebrew forms without added Hellenistic endings, while 16 % are represented by Hellenized endings: R.L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (JSJSup 124; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 190–191. Similar statistics are found in an earlier study by Troxel, "What's in a Name? Contemporization and Toponyms in LXX-Isaiah," in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients, Essays Offered to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. R.L. Troxel et al.; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 327–344 (329).

16 See the examples in n. 8 and see further in Isaiah Αἰλμ (אֵילִם) in 15:8, Πόλις-ασεδεκ in 19:18, καὶ οἱ Σεβων (סִבּוֹנִים) in 45:14.

17 In Job, Proverbs, and Lamentations, this percentage is equally high, but in each of these books the data are not numerous enough for a significant analysis.

18 See N.G. Cohen, "Jewish Names as Cultural Indicators in Antiquity," *JSJ* 7 (1976): 97–128. Most of the names recorded in the *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* (ed. V.A. Tcherikover, A. Fuks, and M. Stern; Cambridge, MA/Jerusalem: Harvard University Press/Magnes Press, 1957–1964) are of the type of Ἀβραμὸς such as are rare in the LXX.

Thackeray mentions the following declension groups of Hellenized names with Greek endings, also reflected in LXX of Isaiah:¹⁹

1.1 *Personal Names*

1. Hellenized masculine names of the first declension ending with -ς, e.g. Ἰωνᾶς, Μωυσῆς, Ἰησοῦς.
2. Female nouns of the first declension (e.g. Λεία).
3. Theophoric names ending in -ίας (e.g. Ἰερεμίας).
4. Mixed declension (partially declined) nouns in -ας, -ης, -(ε)ις, -ους, involving a nom. with -ς, an acc. with ν, and the other case endings as in Hebrew.
5. Partly declinable nouns in -ών (sometimes reflecting η-), e.g. Σαμψών and Σαλωμών (rare).

1.2 *Place Names*

1. Place names in -α like Γάζα declined as the first declension feminine.
2. Names of towns ending in -α like Γάλγαλα declined as neuter plurals of the second declension.
3. Place names in -ών (reflecting η-) either declined (e.g. Ασκαλών) or not (e.g. Ακκαρών), as in most cases.

1.3 *Names of Countries*

The names of countries are represented by a variety of endings, exemplified as follows:

- ίς עִלָּם—Ελυμαίς (Dan 8:2); פֶּרֶס—Περσίς (Dan 11:2).
- (ε)ία בָּבֶל—Βαβυλωνία (Isa 11:11 [= ַרְשָׁן?]; 14:23 [no equivalent]; 39:1; Daniel *passim*; elsewhere Βαβυλών, including Isa 13:1,19; 14:4; 21:9; 39:3; 43:14; 47:1; 48:14,20, and the vast majority of the LXX verses); צִידוֹן—Σιδωνία (1 Kgs 17:9).
- אֶחָהּ הַדּוֹ—Ἰνδική (Esth 1:1; 3:12; 8:9; Dan 3:1 [no equivalent]).
- αία (ה) גִּלְיָל—Γαλιλαία (Joshua, 1–2 Kings, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Joel, 1 Chronicles); Ἰδομαία (see § 5); Ἰουδαία (see § 5).
- ίτις / ἵτις הַחֹרֶן—Αυρανίτις (Ezek 47:16, 18); עֵיִן—Αὐσίτις (Job 1:1; 32:2; 42:17); בָּשָׁן—Βασανίτις (Joshua, Ezekiel, Min. Proph.; Joshua [also featuring a few cases of Βασαν]). דָּגֶל—Γαλααδίτις (Joshua, Judges,

¹⁹ See n. 12.

1–2 Samuel, Ezekiel, Min. Proph., 1–2 Chronicles);²⁰ מואב—Μωαβίτις (see § 4); Χανανίτις (Zech 11:7 [no equivalent in MT]).

1.4 *Names of Peoples*

The first two endings are the most frequent ones:²¹

-αῖος e.g. עברי—Ἑβραῖος, אמרי—Ἀμορραῖος.

-ίτης e.g. בית הלחמי—βηθλεεμίτης (1 Sam 16:18), גלעד—Γαλααδίτης (Judg 10:3).

-ιος, e.g. אζώτιος—עוזי (Josh 13:3).

2 *Identifications of Geographic Names*

Since many translators were active in Egypt, they reflected the geography of that country well; they also were aware of several geographic identifications that were known to people living in the Hellenistic period.²² At the same time, the translator of Isaiah turned more to transliterations than to Hellenized nouns.²³ Some examples of such identifications follow, mainly for Isaiah, leaving aside the more obvious ones.

א(ו)ן—Ἡλίου πόλις (Gen 41:45, 50; 46:20). This city in lower Egypt, already mentioned by Herodotus II.3, 7, 59, was well known for the worship of the sun god, Ra. It is mentioned in Jer 43:13 as *Beth Shemesh*.

ארם, נהרים, ארם נהרים, ארם—Μεσοποταμία (Μεσοποταμία Συρίας in Gen 33:18). This term occurs in the LXX from Gen 24:10 onwards. In Greek literature, it is evidenced from Polybius v.44.6 onwards (second century BCE).

אשדוד—Ἀζωτος (Isa 20:1 and *passim* in the LXX, but not in Josh 11:22; 15:46, 47 where the word is transliterated as Ασεδωθ). Ἀζωτος is the regular Greek name

20 These books also use Γαλααδ. Other books use only Γαλααδ.

21 The endings -αῖος and -ίτης interchange, see Thackeray, *Grammar*, 171. E.g. “Midianite” is represented by both Μαδιοναῖος (Gen 37:28; 37:36) and Μαδιανίτης (Num 10:29).

22 For early insights in this area, see H.A. Redpath, “The Geography of the Septuagint,” *AJTh* 7 (1903): 289–307. For a brief recent study, see G.M. Eidsvåg, “The Rendering of Toponyms in the LXX-Minor Prophets: An Indication of Alexandrian Provenance,” in Peters, *XIV Congress*, 445–455.

23 See n. 15 above.

for Ashdod in the Hellenistic-Roman period and in earlier times. Herodotus 11.157 probably refers to this city. Green points to the phonetic resemblance between Ἀζωτος and אֶזְזָה.²⁴

הדד—Ἰνδική (Esth 1:1 and *passim*; Dan 3:1; 1 Esdr 3:2).

חֲדָקַל—Τίγρις (Τίγρης). This identification occurs in Gen 2:14 and Dan 10:4. The Greek form of the river is attested for the first time by Herodotus 1.189.

כַּפְתּוֹר—Καππαδοκία (Deut 2:23; Am 9:7).²⁵ While the identity of Caphtor is not known (Crete?, Cyprus?), its identification with Cappadocia (central Asia Minor) is unlikely, since Caphtor is referred to as an island in Jer 47:4. The translator of Deuteronomy probably was misled by the similarity in sound of the Hebrew and Greek words. The Greek name is known from literary sources from Herodotus v.49 onwards.

לְבָנוֹן—Ἀντιλίβανος. It is unclear why this name is used for the first Scripture occurrences of לְבָנוֹן in Deut 1:7; 3:25; 11:24; Josh 1:4; 9:1 (all in contexts of the borders of the land) instead of Λίβανος elsewhere in the LXX, from Josh 11:17 onwards. The Greek term denotes a mountain range parallel to the Lebanon. Probably the first translators considered Ἀντιλίβανος the correct identification of לְבָנוֹן while the later translators chose a different one.²⁶

מִדְיָן—οἱ πρέσβεις τῶν Περσῶν (Isa 21:2), read as צִירֵי מִדְיָן. The replacement of Media with Persia reflects the understanding that Persia replaced the empire of the Medes. The same rendering occurs in Jer 25 (32):25, also after a reference to Elam. מִדְיָן = מִגְדוֹן occurs only once elsewhere in Isaiah (13:17).

אֲמוֹן—Διοσπόλις (Ezek 30:14,16) and Μεμφίς (Ezek 30:15).²⁷ From the New Kingdom onwards, the Egyptian city Thebes was named “the city of Amun” after

24 E. Green in <http://www.losttrails.com/herald/messages/33.shtml> (“Geographic names of places in Israel in Herodotus”).

25 The Hebrew word was transliterated in the LXX of Gen 10:14 and it remained without equivalent in Jer 47:4.

26 For an attempt to explain this equivalent, see M.N. van der Meer, *Formation and Reformulation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses* (VTSup 102; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2004), 208: “... a concern to reserve ‘Antilebanon’ for the area promised by God, and ‘Lebanon’ for the unconquered territory.”

27 The occurrences of אֲמוֹן in Jer 46 (26):25 and Nah 3:8 were not understood by the translators.

the name of the city's main god; hence the references to "No Amon" and "No" in Scripture.²⁸ Its Greek equivalent was Dio(s)polis, "city of Zeus," and therefore the identification in the LXX of Ezekiel is appropriate. The identification as Memphis is less apparent.

גך—Μέμφις (Isa 19:13; Jer 2:16; 46[26]:14, 19; Ezek 30:13; Hos 9:6 [גך]). This identification reflects the translators' knowledge of this city.

סבא—Σοήνη (Isa 43:3): "I give Egypt as a ransom for you, Ethiopia and Saba in exchange for you"—LXX "I have made Egypt and Ethiopia and Soene your exchange on your behalf."²⁹ This identification (Aswan in upper Egypt) occurs only here in the LXX, while in 45:14 MT "Egypt's wealth and Nubia's gains and Sabaïtes (סבאים), long of limb ..." is rendered differently by "Egypt has worked hard, and has the commerce of the Ethiopians, and the lofty men of Σεβωίτη ..." Elsewhere, סבא is transliterated as Σαβά in Gen 10:7 and 1 Chr 1:9.

סן—Σάις (Ezek 30:15) and Σοήνη (Ezek 30:16). Σοήνη appears also as the equivalent of סונה in Ezek 29:10 and 30:6.

צידון—Φοινίκη. Sidon is the most important city in Phoenicia and therefore this replacement is understandable. It occurs only once (Isa 23:2), followed in the same chapter by its regular LXX equivalent, Σιδών (vv. 4, 12).

צן—Τάνις (everywhere, starting with Num 13:22, and including Isa 19:11, 30:4). The Greek name is mentioned for the first time in Herodotus 11.66.

שנער—Βαβυλωνία. In Genesis, Shinar is transliterated as Σενναάρ (10:10; 11:2; 14:1, 9), while elsewhere Shinar is correctly identified as Βαβυλωνία (Isa 11:11) and Βαβυλών (Zech 5:11 and Dan 1:2).

ששן—Καρχηδών Isa 23:1, 6, 10, 14 (cf. Ezek 27:12, 25 and 38:13—Καρχηδόνιοι). The LXX equivalent (= Carthage, see Herodotus 11.157) is the main argument for the identification of Tarshish as Carthage. This identification is by no means

See also A. van der Kooij, "The City of Alexandria and the Ancient Versions of the Hebrew Bible," *JNWSL* 25 (1999): 137–149 (142–144).

28 See D.B. Redford, "Thebes," *ABD*, 6:442–443.

29 Or: "I have made Egypt your ransom, and Ethiopia and Soene the ones instead of you" (alternative translation offered by *NETS*).

accepted among scholars and, in fact, a city in Spain is favored by a greater number of scholars.³⁰ In Isa 60:9 and 66:19, this word is transliterated as Θαρσις as elsewhere in the LXX (for the inconsistency, see § 5 below).

On the other hand, פלשתים was not identified by the Greek translators who either transliterated this word in the books Genesis–Joshua (Φυλιστι(ε)ιμ) or provided an etymological-phonetic rendering in the remaining books, including Isa 2:6; 11:4; 14:29, 31 (ἀλλόφυλοι). Also Νείλος, used for the first time in Hesiod, *Theog.* 338, is not used in the LXX. Instead, the translators represented נַחַשׁ with ποταμός.

3 Actualizations and Exegesis

More than other translators, the translator of Isaiah represented names in his *Vorlage* with exegetical renderings. This procedure reflects a rather daring intervention by the translator, to which Seeligmann devoted a sizeable analysis.³¹ Some of these renderings represent the historical situation depicted by Hebrew Scripture with updated versions.

9:11 MT “*Aram* from the east and *Philistia* from the west—who devoured Israel with greedy mouths”—LXX “*Syria* from the rising of the sun, and the *Greeks* from the setting of the sun—those who devour Israel with open mouth.” In this verse, the enemies of the time of the prophet Isaiah (Aram in the north-east and the Philistines in the south-west) were replaced in the LXX with those of the translator’s time. The equivalents chosen are intentional, since elsewhere in the LXX of Isaiah אֲרָם is rendered differently: Αραμ (7:1, 2, 5, 8) and τῶν Σύρων (17:3).³² This is also the only place where “Philistines” is rendered with Ἑλλήνας in the LXX.³³ These equivalents show that the translator of Isa 9:11 referred to the enemies of his time, the Seleucid Empire in Syria, and the Hellenistic coastal cities in the west.

30 See D.B. Baker, “Tarshish,” *ABD*, 6:332–333. See also the lengthy analysis of van der Kooij, *Oracle of Tyre*, 40–47.

31 Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 76–81, re-published in *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies* (ed. R. Hanhart & H. Spieckermann; *FAT* 40; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 231–238. For a valuable subsequent study, see Troxel, “What’s in a Name?”

32 Συρία is the main rendering of אֲרָם elsewhere in the LXX.

33 See § 2.

10:9 MT “Was Calno any different from Carchemish? Or *Hamath* from Arpad?” —LXX “(Did I not take the country) above Babylon and Chalanne, where the tower was built? And I took *Arabia* and Damascus and Samaria.” The unusual identification of חמת with Arabia is found here as well as in Isa 11:11, where the elements of the verse appear in the LXX in a different sequence.³⁴ Usually חמת indicates the most northern border of Israel and is transliterated as Εμαθ / Ημαθ / Αιμαθ (including Isa 36:19; 37:13).³⁵ On the other hand, the LXX’s translation in 10:9 may reflect an identification of חמת or Arabia different from the conventional identifications.³⁶ Seeligmann surmises that the translator of v. 11 refers to the Jewish diasporas of his time, which would have included Arabia.³⁷

נחל מצרים—Πινοκοροῦρων (Isa 27:12).³⁸ Everywhere else in the LXX, this geographic term is rendered by its stereotyped renderings, involving φάραγξ, ποταμός, or χεῖμαρρος and Αἴγυπτος. On the other hand, the translator of Isaiah contemporized the term as Rhinocorura (literally: the Place of the Mutilated Noses), the main border town between Egypt and Syria in Hellenistic times, known today as al-Arish.³⁹

34 “... from Assyria—as also from Egypt, Pathros, Nubia, Elam, Shinar, Hamath, and the coastlands.” LXX: “... whatever is left from the Assyrians, and from Egypt and Babylonia and Ethiopia, and from the Ailamites and from where the sun rises and from out of Arabia.”

35 The rendering of 15:7 נחל הערבים (valley of willows) as τὴν φάραγγα Ἀραβας is not related to this interpretation, since in that rendering it is based on a different reading of the consonants of MT.

36 In this verse, Arpad is not represented in the LXX, and although a phonetic representation of Arpad and Ἀραβία is attractive, it is very unlikely and would not explain the equivalents in Isa 11:11. Besides, in that verse, another word is also lacking in the LXX, viz. Pathros.

37 Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 79; see also van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 37–38 and Troxel, “What’s in a Name?”

38 MT: “And in that day, the Lord will beat out the peoples like grain from the channel of the Euphrates to the Wadi of Egypt,” LXX: “And it shall be on that day that the Lord will fence them in from the channel of the river to Rhinocorura.”

39 The town is named after the cutting of the noses of criminals. See P. Figueras, “The Road Linking Palestine and Egypt along the Sinai Coast,” in *The Madaba Map Centenary 1897–1997. Travelling through the Byzantine Umayyad Period. Proceedings of the International Conference Held in Amman, 7–9 April 1997* (ed. M. Piccirillo and E. Alliata; SBF Collectio Maior 40; Jerusalem 1999), 223; idem, in <http://198.62.75.1/www1/ofm/mad/articles/FiguerasSinai.html>. See also J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATA XII.3; Münster i. W.: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuch-handlung, 1934), 203.

בשן—Γαλιλαία. In addition to the transliteration Βασαν (Isa 2:13 and elsewhere in the LXX), mentioned in § 5, בשן is rendered quite unexpectedly Γαλιλαία in Isa 33:9;⁴⁰ MT “Sharon is become like a desert, and Bashan and Carmel are stripped bare”—LXX “Saron became marshes; Galilee and Carmel will become visible.” The parallel nouns in this verse (Sharon, Carmel) probably influenced the translator into replacing Bashan with a mountain ridge west of the Jordan.

37:38 MT “They fled to the land of Ararat”—LXX “... but they escaped into Armenia.” The exegetical process of identifying Ararat with Armenia, not reflected elsewhere in the LXX,⁴¹ but quoted by Josephus⁴² may well reflect contemporary exegesis.⁴³

46:1 MT “Bel is bowed, Nebo is cowering”—LXX “Bel has fallen; Dagon has been crushed.” Elsewhere, Δαγων represents דגון and Ναβαυ or Ναβου represent נבו (including Isa 15:2) showing that the translator made an effort to use a special equivalent. Bel Marduk was revered together with his first-born Nabu (thus MT). However, the translator may have known Dagon as a Babylonian deity alongside Bel Marduk, and against this background he may have contemporized the translation, although the full exegetical picture is unclear.

49:12 MT “(Look! These are coming from afar, these from the north and the west,) and these from the land of Sinim”—LXX “... but others from the land of the Persians.” The context of bringing people from a faraway country may have led the translator to refer to the Jewish diaspora,⁴⁴ while the identification of the Sinim remains contested among scholars.

Beyond Isaiah, note the following rendering:

כרתים—Ῥωμαῖοι Dan 11:30. In addition to transliterated names, Κίτιοι (Gen 10:4; 1 Chr 1:7), Κιτιαῖοι (Num 24:24; Isa 23:1), Κιτιεῖς (Isa 23:12), Χεττιμ/ν (Jer 2:10; Ezek 27:6), the LXX of Daniel contemporized the Hebrew by representing this word as “Romans.” The Greek word occurs only here in the canonical books of the LXX.

40 In Isa 8:23, Γαλιλαία reflects גליל.

41 In Gen 8:4; 2 Kgs 19:37, Jer 51 (28):27, Ararat is transcribed as Αραράτ.

42 Jos. *Ant.* 1.3.6 § 93 quoting from “Berosus the Chaldean.”

43 Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 77–78.

44 Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 79.

4 Select Equivalents in Isaiah

אֲדוּם is consistently transliterated as Εδωμ in the LXX from Genesis until Daniel (49×). At the same time, the first Hellenizing rendering Ἰδουμαία occurs in Gen 36:16⁴⁵ and afterwards often elsewhere (40×).⁴⁶ The following books do not seem to distinguish between the two Greek renderings: Joshua, 1–2 Kings (note the mixture of the two Greek options in 1 Kgs 11:14–16), Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, 1–2 Chronicles. Isaiah uses mainly Ἰδουμαία (11:14; 21:11 [דומה]; 34:5, 6) and once Εδωμ (63:1).

אֲשׁוּר. The differences between the various LXX translators come to the fore in the renderings of this word. That Asshur was rendered in different ways can be seen most clearly through the three ways of representing the phrase מֶלֶךְ אֲשׁוּר (king of Assyria/the Assyrians): βασιλεὺς Ἀσσοῦρ in 1–2 Chronicles (12×), Ezra–Nehemiah (3×), Jer 50 (27):17, 18; βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων (the only translation in 2 Kings [43×]) and βασιλεὺς (τῶν) Ἀσσυρίων (with the exception of 10:12 [ἄρχων], the only translation in Isaiah [25×]); and βασιλεὺς Ἀσσύριος (“the Assyrian king”) in Nah 3:18.

1. אֲשׁוּר—Ἀσσύριοι. From Genesis 2 onwards, the main LXX rendering of the singular form Asshur is the plural Ἀσσύριοι, mainly in the phrase מֶלֶךְ אֲשׁוּר and only in the Torah and Prophets in additional contexts. The translator of Genesis distinguished between the eponymic figure Asshur whose name he transliterated as Ἀσσοῦρ in 10:11, 22 and the geographic unit Asshur = Assyria (2:14 MT “The name of the third river is Tigris, the one that flows east of Asshur”). In that verse, he did not employ the equivalent geographic term Ἀσσυρία, but the name of the people, “the Assyrians”: “The name of the third river is Tigris, the one that flows east of the Assyrians (Ἀσσυρίων).” In fact, Ἀσσυρία does not occur in the translation of the canonical books,⁴⁷ although it was used in classical sources from Herodotus 1.178, 185, onwards. The equivalent

45 The transliteration Εδωμ occurs ten times in the same chapter: vv. 1, 8, 9, 17, 19, 21, 22, 30, 32, 43.

46 Josh 15:1; 2 Sam 8:12, 13, 14; 1 Kgs 11:1, 14, 15, 16; 2 Kgs 14:10; Amos 1:6, 9, 11; 2:1; Joel 4:19; Obad 8; Mal 1:4; Isa 11:14; 34:5, 6; Jer 25:21 (32:7); 27:3 (34:2); 40 (47):11; 49:7, 17, 20, 22 (29:8, 18, 21, 23); Ps 60 (59):10, 11; 108 (107): 10, 11; Lam 4:21; Ezek 25:12, 13, 14, 35:15; 36:5; 1 Chr 18:11, 12; 2 Chr 8:17; 25:19.

47 It occurs only in 4 Macc 13:9. It is difficult to know why Ἀσσυρία was not used in the LXX. If this non-use was intentional, possibly the translators wished to avoid a confusion with Συρία = Aram.

אשור—'Assúrioi disregarding the content of the word in the context ("Assyria") is not natural in Genesis 2, nor is it natural in many subsequent verses.⁴⁸ Accordingly, it seems as if this equivalent was determined by the translator of Genesis regardless of the first occurrence of the word in Hebrew Scripture. It is not impossible that the equivalence מלך אשור—βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων formed the background for the standard equivalent of Asshur in the LXX from its first occurrence onwards. The equivalent in Gen 2:14 is the more surprising in view of the equivalent of a geographic unit in the previous verse, v. 13 (כיש—τήν γῆν Αἰθιοπίας). The next geographic units are transliterated (8:4 Ararat; all the names in the Table of the Nations in chapter 10; Egypt in chapter 12, often rendered in later contexts as "Egyptians"). The rendering אשור—'Assúrioi of Gen 2:14 is to recur often in the later books of the LXX.

When we meet Asshur again in the Torah, we read in Gen 25:18 MT "They dwelt from Havilah, by Shur, which is close to Egypt, all the way to Asshur (באכה אשורה)." Also this word is rendered in the LXX by the name of the people (ἐλθεῖν πρὸς Ἀσσυρίους). As in Gen 2:14, this rendering is unexpected not only because of the content, but also because the other geographic term in 25:18, Egypt (מצרים) is rendered by a Greek noun "Egypt" (Αἴγυπτου).

In the third occurrence of Asshur in the Torah, in Num 24:22 "When Asshur takes you captive" we find again the equivalent אשור—'Assúrioi. This time the equivalent is matched by similar equivalents in the context, both based on the Hebrew (v. 21 קיני—Καιναῖον, 24 כתיים—Κιτταῖων) and not based on the Hebrew (v. 24 עברי—Ἑβραῖους). The translation of this context is inconsistent, since the second occurrence of אשור, "They subject Asshur" is transliterated as Ἀσσοῦρ (v. 24).

In 2 Kings (4 Kgdms), Asshur is consistently rendered Ἀσσύριοι, almost always in the phrase "king of Asshur"—βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων (44×). This equivalent is applied in such a wooden fashion that it includes such renderings as 2 Kgs 18:11 MT "and the king of Asshur deported the Israelites to Asshur"—LXX "and the king of the Assyrians deported the Israelites to the Assyrians." Similar renderings are found in 2 Kgs 15:29; 17:6, 23.

48 The possibility that the phrase κατέναντι Ἀσσυρίων represents a neuter plural noun *Ἀσσύρια is attractive, since it would explain also the frequent phrase βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρίων as well as the lack of the article in most instances. A neuter form, otherwise not known, would parallel such neuter place names as Γάλγαια, Γέραρα, Ἐκβάτανα, Σόδομα, etc., mentioned by Thackeray, *Grammar*, 168. However, this option is impossible in view of the occurrence of the nominative and accusative plurals Ἀσσύριοι (Num 24:22; Isa 19:23, 30:31, 52:4) and Ἀσσυρίους (Gen 25:18; 2 Kgs 15:29, 17:6, 23; Hos 5:13, 7:11; Isa 19:23) for Asshur.

In Isaiah, the rendering Ἀσσύριοι occurs 40 times, both in the phrase “king of Asshur” (25×) and in other contexts (17×) such as 10:5 **הוי אשור**—ὁ Ἀσσυρίων; 19:23 **אשורה** (to the land of Asshur)—πρὸς Ἀσσυρίους. In the latter verse, the translation of Asshur differs from that of Egypt (**מצרים**), rendered twice with the singular noun Αἰγύπτως (Egypt). In this verse, **אשור** is rendered with the name of the people, except for the end of the verse where the plural form of *mišrayim* in **את אשור ועבדו מצרים** (“and the Egyptians shall serve together with Asshur”) is matched by a Greek plural for Asshur. Isa 31:8 contains yet a different rendering (see below, Ἀσσυρ).

As in Isa 19:23, in Hos 9:3, 11:11, 12:2; Zech 10:10, 11; Jer 2:18, Egypt is rendered by a noun in the singular, while Asshur is represented by the plural noun Ἀσσύριοι. On the other hand, in Jer 2:36 and 50 (27):17, 18 Ἀσσυρ is used, including in the phrase **אשור מלך** king of Assyria—βασιλεὺς Ἀσσυρ.

2. The renderings in Ezekiel are inconsistent: Ἀσσυρ in 16:28 (**בני אשור**) and 27:23; 31:3; 32:22, but in the other verses Ἀσσύριοι (23:5, 7, 9, 12, 23, in all verses except for v. 5 rendering **בני אשור**).⁴⁹ With two exceptions, the translator of the Minor Prophets used Ἀσσύριοι (15×). The exceptions are Ἀσσυρ in Hos 14:4 and Mic 5:5 (probably because of the transcription of Nimrod in the parallel phrase) and Ἀσσύριος in Nah 3:18, Mic 5:4, and Zeph 2:13.

3. Ἀσσυρ also represents **אשור** in Ps 83 (82):9; Lam 5:6; Ezr 4:2, 6:22; Neh 9:32; and Chronicles (16×).

Isa-LXX thus reflects the main LXX practice of rendering **אשור** with the plural Ἀσσύριοι.⁵⁰ In the first chapters of Genesis, this equivalent occurs quite unexpectedly and inappropriately, possibly reflecting knowledge of the later books in that translation. The rendering of the singular **אשור** with the plural Ἀσσύριοι may be compared with similar equivalents of **כוש**—Αἰθίοπες (see n. 50), **עלם**—Αἰλαμίται (21:2; 22:6), **מדי**—Πέρσαι (21:2), while most renderings

49 The differences are not related to the possible distinction between three different translators in this book: chapters 1–27; 28–39; 40–48. See H.St.J. Thackeray, “The Greek Translators of Ezekiel,” *JTS* 4 (1902–1903): 398–411; Tov, *Jeremiah—Baruch*, 135–151. On the other hand, P.D.M. Turner, *The Septuagint Version of Chapters i–xxxix of the Book of Ezekiel* (Ph.D. diss.; Oxford University, 1970) maintains the unity of the translation.

50 This type of rendering resembles the equivalent **כוש**—Αἰθίοπες, but that equivalent was used skillfully (see below), while Ἀσσύριοι was used indiscriminately. **מצרים**—Αἰγύπτωι does not provide a good parallel because of the possible confusion between the different vocalizations *mišrayim* and *mišrim*.

of “Egypt,” “Babel,” “Ethiopia,” “Judah” are rendered with singular forms. The translator’s special approach to these nations may be shown in Isa 11:11 ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων καὶ ἀπὸ Αἰγύπτου καὶ Βαβυλωνίας καὶ Αἰθιοπίας καὶ ἀπὸ Αἰλαμιτῶν καὶ ἀπὸ ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν καὶ ἐξ Ἀραβίας where MT has only singular forms.

כּוּשׁ. The eponymic ancestor כּוּשׁ is transliterated as Χούς in Gen 10:6, 7, 8 and 1 Chr 1:8, 9, 10. At the same time, from the very first occurrence of כּוּשׁ, designating the country, it is represented by Αἰθιοπία (Gen 2:13). Often the word is represented by an adjective designating the Ethiopians, as in 2 Kgs 19:9 מֶלֶךְ כּוּשׁ—βασιλέως Αἰθίοπων. The latter two options are skillfully employed in Isaiah where Αἰθιοπία (11:11, 18:1, 43:3) appears alongside Αἰθίοψ (20:3, 4, 5; 37:9; 45:14). This is also the case in Ezekiel, the Minor Prophets, and Psalms.

מוֹאָב. In the great majority of its occurrences, מוֹאָב is represented by the indeclinable Μωαβ in Genesis—2 Kings, Isaiah,⁵¹ Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Min. Proph., Psalms, Job, 1–2 Chronicles (155×). At the same time, LXX-Isa differed from all other translations by its employment of the name of the Hellenistic district Μωαβίτις.⁵² This name was used especially in the Ptolemaic administration for the regions of the southern part of the Ptolemaic province of *Coele Syria* (cf. Σαμαρείτις and Ἀμμωνίτις).⁵³ This translator probably was inconsistent in his translation equivalents (see § 5), although it is not impossible that he distinguished between מוֹאָב as an ethnic unit (Μωαβίτις) and Μωαβ as the eponymic ancestor. This may be the implication of Isa 16:7 “Ah, let Moab howl; Let all in Moab howl!” rendered as (οὐχ οὕτως) ὀλολύξει Μωαβ ἐν γὰρ τῇ Μωαβίτιδι πάντες ὀλολύξουσιν (“Moab shall wail; for in Moabitis all shall wail”).

5 Inconsistency in LXX-Isaiah

What scholars name inconsistency in a translation implies that a translator did not represent the words consistently with the same equivalents. Inconsistency is considered a negative feature that can also be represented positively since

51 15:9; 16:2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14.

52 15:1, 2, 4, 5, 8; 16:7; 25:10. This form is also used once elsewhere: Jer 25:21 (32:7).

53 See A.H.M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937), 241. The translators distinguished between the noun Μωαβ(ε)ίτης, similar to Σαμαρείτις and Ἀμμωνίτις and the adjective Μωαβίτης (Moabite), as in Ruth 1:4.

it often implies that a translator skillfully distinguished between the various meanings/usages/nuances of a word. By so doing he created several translation equivalents for the same Hebrew/Aramaic word. Thus, the translator of Isaiah often creatively played with different translation options in the same context, so as to create literary variation.⁵⁴ While the distinction between inconsistency and literary variation is difficult, in the following examples inconsistency is probably involved. The most frequent representation is mentioned first.

בבל—Βαβυλών / Βαβυλωνία. See § 1.

בשן—Βασσαν / Βασανίτις / Γαλιλαία. See § 3.

יהודה—Ιουδα (5:3, 7; 7:1, 17; 9:20; 11:12, 13; 22:8, 21; 26:1; 40:9; 48:1; 65:9) / Ιουδαία (1:1; 2:1; 3:1; 3:8; 7:6; 8:8; 37:10, 31; 38:9; 44:26) / Ιουδαῖοι (19:17).

כוש—Αἰθιοπία / Αἰθίοψ / Χούς. See § 4.

כרמל—Χερμελ (Josh 12:22; 15:55; Isa 29:17; 32:15) / Κάρμηλος (everywhere else, including Isa 32:16).

מואב—Μωαβ / Μωαβίτις. See § 4.

נבו—Ναβαυ—Ναβου / Δαγων. See § 3.

סבא—Σοήγη (Isa 43:3) / Σεβων—Σαβά. See § 2.

צידון—Σιδών (*passim*, including Isa 23:4, 12) / Σιδωνία (1 Kgs 17:9) / Φοινίκη (Isa 23:2). See § 1.

תרשיש—Θαρσις / Καρχηδών. See § 2.

שומרון—Σαμαρεία (*passim*, including Isa 8:4; 9:8; 10:9–11; 36:19) / Σομορων (Isa 7:9; Neh 3:34) / Σεμερων (1 Kgs 16:24).

54 For examples, see Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 32–46. For examples of inconsistency in LXX-Isa, see Troxel, “What’s in a Name?,” 330.

The above equivalents provide but a small sample of the inconsistencies in the translation of Isaiah,⁵⁵ which do not point to different translations.⁵⁶

In sum, we found that the translator of Isaiah reflects the LXX system of representing personal names in the LXX, especially as in the Prophetic books. He is often inconsistent in his equivalents. In a limited number of cases, the translator added Greek endings to Hebrew/Aramaic words. In line with this translator's exegetical freedom, LXX-Isa stands out among the various LXX translators as someone who contemporized several geographic terms. The equivalent אשור—Ἀσσύριοι takes a special place in this analysis.

55 For similar inconsistency in other books, see צר—Σορ (Ezek 26:2, 3, 4, 7; 27:2, 3, 8 [Ezekiel α]) / Τύρος (everywhere else, including Ezek 28:2, 12; 29:18 [Ezekiel β]). שכם—Συχεμ (majority translation in the LXX including Judges B) / Σιμωα (especially Judges A; minority translation in Genesis).

56 Various scholars have pointed to the possibility that Isaiah was rendered by more than one translator: J. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor?* (BZAW 56; 1930), 2–5; J. Herrmann & F. Baumgärtel, *Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Septuaginta* (BWAT 5; 1923), 20–31. These theories have been refuted by Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 31–46. See also van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 31–32.

Reflections on the Septuagint with Special Attention Paid to the Post-Pentateuchal Translations

1 Introduction

One of the core questions of LXX research is “What *is* the LXX?” This question refers to such matters as the nature of the individual translation units, their place of origin, the relation between the translation units, the nature of Greek Scripture as a whole, and the possible structure and development of the translation enterprise. The case of the Greek Pentateuch is clearer than that of the post-Pentateuchal books and I therefore focus on the latter. These general questions are of limited relevance for the *kleinphilologische* comparison of the LXX with Hebrew texts, but they do pertain to an analysis of the language of the LXX, its relation with the NT, and for many aspects of the LXX that interest linguists, textual critics, historians, and exegetes.

The minimal points most scholars agree on regarding Greek Scriptures are: (1) the translation of the Torah was created in Alexandria;¹ (2) the name “Septuaginta,” although originally attached only to the translation of the Pentateuch, came to denote early on the Greek version of *all* the canonical books of Hebrew Scripture as well as some writings originally composed in Greek; (3) the translations of most if not all canonical books had been completed when Ben Sira’s grandson wrote the introduction to his translation in c. 116 BCE; (4) the text of the original translations was constantly revised towards an ever-changing text of the Hebrew Bible by known and anonymous revisers; (5) the present collection of Greek Scripture includes some of these revisions that replaced the

1 For an updated summary of the positions, see A. van der Kooij, “The Septuagint of the Pentateuch and Ptolemaic Rule,” in *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance* (ed. G.N. Knoppers and B.M. Levinson; Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 289–300. Beyond the Alexandrian option, van der Kooij mentions the possibility that the translation was solicited by “the leading priests in Jerusalem” (297). This and several other topics analyzed here are also discussed in the insightful analysis by T. Rajak, *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

original translations. If we accept these five points, by necessity we posit that the collection of Greek writings named the “LXX” is far from unified and does not do justice to its name. After all, the legendary seventy-two translators of the Pentateuch did not translate the post-Pentateuchal books to which we now turn.

Most of the circumstances surrounding the creation of the various books of Greek Scripture are unknown since we possess no external data about the translators and translations. The only extant information is embedded in legendary miracle stories about the creation of the Greek Torah included in the Epistle of Aristeas and subsequent sources.² However, the minimal information contained in these sources is analyzed time and again as if it is reliable and pertains also to the post-Pentateuchal books. Schenker discredits that story as well as several explanations given in the past for the initiative to render the Hebrew Torah into Greek.³ His own view is that the translation of the Torah was created as a “light to the nations” as prescribed in Deut 4:6–8. Be that as it may, the Epistle of Aristeas has greatly influenced the analysis of the Greek translation of the Torah. I suggest that it also influenced adversely the analysis of the post-Pentateuchal books. The distinction between the Torah and the post-Pentateuchal books is usually not made in LXX research, and it is precisely because of this reason that I decided to focus on this issue.

The approach of many modern scholars towards the post-Pentateuchal versions was already shaped in antiquity. In the second century CE the story of the seventy translators was referred to as applying also to these books. In his *Apologia* (c. 152–155 CE), Justin Martyr extends the story of the translation initiated by King Ptolemy to all the Greek Scripture writings that in his treatise are considered “prophetic writings,” presenting prophecies about the coming of Christ.⁴ This tendency is continued in Justin’s later treatise *Dialogue with Trypho*.⁵ The same tendency is visible in Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus*

2 For modern discussions of this source, see Hengel, *Septuagint*, 75–80; A. & D. Wasserstein, *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

3 A. Schenker, “Wurde die Tora wegen ihrer einzigartigen Weisheit auf Griechisch übersetzt? Die Bedeutung der Tora für die Nationen in Dt 4:6–8 als Ursache der Septuaginta,” *FZPhTh* 54 (2007): 327–347.

4 For a detailed analysis, see Hengel, *Septuagint*, 25–36.

5 For example, in *Dialogue with Trypho* 68:7 Justin Martyr explicitly refers to the Greek rendering of Isa 7:14 as having been produced by the seventy elders who produced their translation for the Egyptian king Ptolemy. See further Hengel, *Septuagint*, 30, n. 14. For a detailed

§§ 3, 6. It would take a long time before the exact contents of the Christian canon were fixed. At the synod of Carthage (397) the Christian canon was more or less finalized, but the exact list was only completed at the council of Trent in 1546. Consequently, the earliest comprehensive manuscripts of the LXX from the fourth and fifth centuries CE, A, B, and S, differ in the selection of the canonical and apocryphal books and their sequence.

The LXX was a Jewish translation, but when we encounter the completed collection of Greek Scripture for the first time in manuscripts, the majority tradition of B and others was shaped as a Christian collection in which the order of the books follows Christian perceptions.

Although modern scholars realize that the expansion of the name Septuagint to include the post-Pentateuchal books is secondary, they are often unconsciously influenced by that name in their analysis of the later translations.

2 The Post-Pentateuchal Versions

There are many open questions relating to the post-Pentateuchal versions: Are they Jewish? Are they Alexandrian? Were they produced within official projects? And are they homogeneous? Also, what is known about the compilation of the collection of translations, and what do we know about the Hebrew text underlying these translations? When addressing these issues we realize that there are more questions than answers.⁶

2.1 *Are the Post-Pentateuchal Versions Jewish?*

The Jewish character of the Pentateuch translation is well established, while that of the post-Pentateuchal books is not, although this assumption is almost certainly correct.

The translation of the Torah was a Jewish venture, created for Jews and probably also Gentiles.⁷ The translation contains some Aramaic words reflecting

and updated analysis of the texts used by Justin Martyr, see O. Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition, Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (NTSup 56; Leiden: Brill, 1987).

6 It is rare to find such a realistic note as in Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, 703: "But with few exceptions (pp. 575, 592, 597) we know nothing at all about the persons, period and method of working of the individual translators, and hence are here entirely dependent upon investigation of the individual books of G itself."

7 S. Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative*

the language spoken by the Jews,⁸ and in some cases the Greek Torah reflects Midrash-like exegesis that is also found in rabbinic sources.⁹ Aptowitz¹⁰ and Prijs¹¹ provide examples for the post-Pentateuchal books, but the evidence is not impressive.

The Greek Torah reflects neologisms in the Greek language meant to represent some of the special Jewish customs or terms, such as the names of the festivals, for which no words existed in the Greek language.¹² This translation was used by Jews in their weekly ceremonial reading from the first century BCE onwards.¹³ Likewise, Philo refers to this custom in Alexan-

of the *Letter of Aristeas* (London: Routledge, 2003) suggests that the LXX was prepared against the background of Homeric scholarship.

- 8 For example, $\sigma\alpha\beta\beta\alpha\tau\alpha$ (Hebrew שבת and Aramaic שבתא) and $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\alpha$ (Hebrew פסח, Aramaic פסחא).
- 9 Jewish exegesis is visible wherever a special interpretation of the LXX is known also from rabbinic literature. Such exegesis reveals the Palestinian background or influence of at least some of the translators. For example, the “second tithe” in the LXX of Deut 26:12 (MT *shenat ha-ma’aser*, “the year of the tithe,” read as *shenit ha-ma’aser*, as if, “second, the tithe”) represents the rabbinic term *ma’aser sheni* (“second tithe”). For examples relating to the Torah, see Z. Frankel, *Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipzig: Barth, 1851); J. Fürst, “Spüren der palästinisch-jüdischen Schriftdeutung und Sagen in der Übersetzung der LXX,” *Semitic Studies in Memory of Rev. Dr. Alexander Kohut* (ed. G.A. Kohut; Berlin: S. Calvary, 1897), 152–166; Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition*; S. Safrai, “Halakha,” in *The Literature of the Sages*. CRINT, Section Two, 3 (ed. S. Safrai; Assen-Maastricht and Philadelphia: Fortress Press/Van Gorcum, 1987), 137–139. Additional literature published before 1948 on rabbinic exegesis is mentioned by Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition*, xiii and 105.
- 10 V. Aptowitz, “Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zu Septuaginta und Vulgata, I. Die Bücher Samuelis,” *ZAW* 29 (1909): 241–252.
- 11 Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition*, especially relating to Psalms and Proverbs.
- 12 For example, the word $\delta\lambda\sigma\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omega\mu\alpha$ (“whole-burnt offering”) was probably coined by the translators to reflect the special meaning of the *’olah* offering. Further, the Greek Torah made a distinction between two types of “altar” (מזבח), a Jewish one rendered $\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\text{-}\rho\iota\sigma\omicron\nu$, and a pagan altar rendered $\beta\acute{\omega}\mu\omicron\varsigma$. The Aramaic Targumim likewise distinguished between the Jewish מזבחא and the pagan אגורא (literally “heap of stones”). This distinction derived from the translators’ wish to differentiate between terms relating to the Jewish religion and those relating to the religions of the non-Jews.
- 13 Early papyri of the Pentateuch from Egypt (P.Ryl. Gk. 458 [200–150 BCE] and P.Fouad 266a–c [1st century BCE]) show that the Greek translation was known in various parts of the country, but they do not necessarily prove use in religious gatherings. On the other hand, M. Rösel, *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung: Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta* (BZAW 223; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994), 256 does not believe that the Torah was read publicly in Greek in the pre-Christian centuries.

dria¹⁴ and 4 Macc 18:10–18, possibly written in Egypt in the first century CE, expressly mentions the reading of the Law accompanied by readings taken from the Prophets, Psalms, and Hagiographa.

At the same time, the Jewish background of the post-Pentateuchal books cannot be proven as conclusively, although we have little doubt that Jews translated these books in the third and second pre-Christian centuries. There probably were no Gentiles in Egypt or elsewhere who would have had the skills to make such a trans-cultural translation, or would have had an incentive to do so.

Support for the assumption of the Jewish background of the post-Pentateuchal translations comes from the following areas:¹⁵

- a. Reliance on the Greek Torah by the later translators.¹⁶
- b. Midrashic renderings to a very limited extent (probably embedded in the Hebrew *Vorlage*).¹⁷
- c. The Jewish background of the translation of Isaiah, as laid out in detail by I.L. Seeligmann, is reflected in several terms and ideas.¹⁸
- d. The Greek version of Proverbs includes Jewish exegesis.¹⁹

14 Philo, *Prob.* 81–82: “In these they are instructed at all other times, but particularly on the seventh days. For that day has been set apart to be kept holy and on it they abstain from all other work and proceed to sacred spots which they call synagogues ... Then one takes the books and reads aloud ...” See further Philo, *Hypoth.* 7:13; *Vit. Mos.* 2:215. The existence of Greek Torah scrolls is also referred to in *m. Meg.* 1:8; 2:1 and *t. Meg.* 4:13. See further Wasserstein & Wasserstein, *Legend*, 11–12.

15 Liturgical use is indicated by details in the superscriptions of many Psalms in the LXX beyond those in MT. See the views of van der Kooij described in n. 32 below. See also n. 36 below. However, this liturgical use can only have been Christian.

16 See my study “The Impact of the LXX Translation of the Pentateuch on the Translation of the Other Books,” in *Greek—Hebrew Bible*, 183–194.

17 The evidence pertains mainly to Joshua and 1 Kings: E. Tov, “Midrash-Type Exegesis in the LXX of Joshua,” in *Greek—Hebrew Bible*, 153–163; D.W. Gooding, “Problems of Text and Midrash in the Third Book of Reigns,” *Textus* 7 (1969): 1–29, in both cases involving mainly Midrash-like exegesis.

18 I.L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah* (Mededelingen en Verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap “Example Oriente Lux” 9; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1948), 70–121.

19 Most of the discrepancies between the Hebrew and Greek versions of this book probably derived from the free translation character of the LXX, which gives us insights into the exegetical and theological world of the Alexandrian-Hellenistic Jewish community. This pertains especially to the trend in stressing the virtues of the pious and vices of the impious

2.2 *Place of Origin of the Post-Pentateuchal Books*

The Alexandrian background of the post-Pentateuchal books is presupposed by many, if not most scholars, but this assumption is unlikely. The evidence for such an assumption, which is not supported by any hard data, has not been formulated, but the assumption could be supported by the following arguments:

- a. Analogy to the story about the Egyptian translation of the Torah, although that translation itself was probably produced by imported Palestinian experts.
- b. “Alexandrian” characteristics²⁰ of the translation, such as its Egyptian-Greek language²¹ and its connections with the Egyptian demotic language.²²

(see 1:10, 18, 19, 22, 31, 32) as well as to adherence to the νόμος. Thus, in 17:11 the translation implies that the מלאך (“messenger,” “angel”) of MT is sent by the Lord. See further J. Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (VTSup 69; Leiden/New York/Cologne: E.J. Brill, 1997).

20 For a very helpful summary, see G. Dorival in Harl—Dorival—Munnich, *Septante*, 55–56.

21 J.A.L. Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SCS 14; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press) showed that the LXX of the Torah reflects in many words and technical terms the Greek language of its time, that of the third century, but he did not always stress the Egyptian background, even though the parallels were found in papyri found in Egypt. A. Passoni dell’Acqua stressed the Egyptian background of the LXX vocabulary in a long series of studies on individual words appearing in *different* books of the LXX, e.g. “La versione dei LXX e i papyri: note lessicali,” in *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Congress of Papyrology, New York, 24–31 July 1980* (ed. R.S. Bagnall et al.; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981), 621–632; “Ricerche sulla versione dei LXX e i papiri, I *Pastophorion*. II *Nomos*. III *Andrizesthai*,” *Aegyptus* 61 (1981): 171–211; 62 (1982): 178–194; “La terminologia dei reati nei προστάγματα dei Tolemei e nella versione dei LXX,” *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology, Athens 25–31 May 1986*, II (Athens 1988), 335–350; “Notazioni cromatiche dall’Egitto greco-romano. La versione del LXX e i papiri,” *Aegyptus* 78 (1998): 77–115. See further the bibliography given by M. Harl, “La langue de la Septante,” in Harl—Dorival—Munnich, *Septante*, 243. A special type of Egyptian *couleur locale* is assumed by J. Joosten, “Language as Symptom: Linguistic Clues to the Social Background of the Seventy,” *Textus* 24 (2007): 69–80. According to Joosten, “... the group among which the version came into being consisted largely of soldiers” (p. 80).

22 Several examples are unconvincing, and most of them pertain to the Torah (Niv Alon of the Hebrew University kindly helped me to analyze these cases). The main arguments were provided by S. Morenz, “Ägyptische Spuren in der Septuaginta,” *Mullus, Festschrift T. Klauser* (JbAC, Ergänzungsband 1; 1964), 250–258 = idem, *Religion und Geschichte des alten Ägypten. Gesammelte Aufsätze* (ed. E. Blumenthal et al.; Cologne: Böhlau, 1975), 417–428. See further: M. Görg, “Die Septuaginta im Kontext spätägyptische Kultur: Beispiele

The assumption of an Alexandrian background of the translation is so strong that one often speaks about the “Alexandrian version.” Furthermore, not only has the Greek version been dubbed “Alexandrian,” but its Hebrew/Aramaic *Vorlage* has been likewise so named.²³

The following questions should be raised regarding the assumption that the post-Pentateuchal translations of the Greek books were Alexandrian.

- a. Are any unmistakable Alexandrian features in the realia, vocabulary, or ideas reflected in the post-Pentateuchal books? In my view, there is very little evidence. At least in the case of the Egyptian-Greek language and the possible connections with the Egyptian demotic language no convincing proofs have been provided. Below we will return to this issue.
- b. If, as according to the story, the Torah translators came from Jerusalem, why would the post-Pentateuchal books have been translated by Alexandrians? In other words, if Alexandria did not produce scholars who were able to translate the Torah, why would such translators be available after many decennia for the later books?
- c. A related question: Should the canonical conception behind the LXX, different from that of MT, be considered Alexandrian even if it does not reflect any Alexandrian features?

lokaler Inspiration bei der Übersetzungsarbeit am Pentateuch,” in *Brennpunkt*, 115–130. The examples mentioned by Görg pertain to the representation of פְּנֵה פַעֲנָה with Ψομφωνίη in Gen 41:45, the rendering of רפאים as “embalmers” (ἐνταφιασταί) in Gen 50:2, the occurrence of the *ibis* in Lev 11:17 (יִנְשׁוּי), and seven additional individual renderings; Y. Koenig, “Quelques ‘égyptianismes’ de la Septante,” *BIFAO* 98 (1998): 223–232 (the strongest examples are the transcription Μωϋσης for מֹשֶׁה and θίβις for the תִּבְיָה in Exodus). For a summary of the arguments used, see F. Siegert, *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament: Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta* (Münsteraner Judaistische Studien 9; Münster: Lit Verlag, 2001), 186–191.

- 23 Thus, e.g., de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen*, 2; Swete, *Introduction*, 1–28 (“The Alexandrian Greek version”); Thackeray, *Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, 13 (“Alexandrian Bible”) and *passim*. My own statement is similarly imprecise: “G is a Jewish translation which was made mainly in Alexandria.” Equally imprecise is my statement concerning the *Vorlage* of the LXX of Jeremiah: “It was still known in the second century BCE in Egypt, when it served as the *Vorlage* for the LXX translation.” (*Greek—Hebrew Bible*, 364). Some of the references to Alexandria and Egypt were probably made inadvertently such as in the name of the following book: H.-J. Stipp, *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches—Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte* (OBO 136; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994).

There are no clear answers to these questions. I suggest that the default assumption for the post-Pentateuchal books should be that they were produced in Palestine, and not in Alexandria or any other part of the Jewish Diaspora (in the latter case, there is no positive evidence in favor of such an assumption). We first list the books of a probable or possible *Palestinian* origin, in order of decreasing probability.

- i. The manuscripts of the Greek Esther contain a colophon²⁴ at the end that states that “it was translated by Lysimachus, the son of Ptolemaius, of the people in Jerusalem (τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ).” Most scholars consider this colophon as pointing to a Palestinian origin.²⁵ Likewise, Hengel considers the translation of Esther to be a “piece of Hasmonaeen propaganda among the Jews of Egypt.”²⁶
- ii. The “LXX” of Ecclesiastes was probably translated in Palestine by either Aquila or *kaige*-Th.²⁷
- iii. Sections of the “LXX” of Samuel–Kings, ascribed in modern research to *kaige*-Th (2 Sam 11:2 (10:2?)–1 Kgs 2:11 and 1 Kgs 22:1–2 Kgs 25),²⁸ were translated in Palestine as were also the following three books.

24 Cf. E.J. Bickerman, “The Colophon of the Greek Book of Esther,” *JBL* 63 (1944): 339–362 = idem, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History, Part One* (AGJU IX; Leiden: Brill, 1976), 225–245; R. Marcus, “Dositheus, Priest and Levite,” *JBL* 64 (1945): 269–271.

25 On the other hand, B. Jacob, “Das Buch Esther bei den LXX,” *ZAW* 10 (1890): 280–290 tried to demonstrate the Egyptian character of the language of this book. This attempt has been refuted by E.J. Bickerman who demonstrated that the words that Jacob considered to be Egyptian were common-Hellenistic: “Notes on the Greek Book of Esther,” *PAAJR* 20 (1951), 115 = idem, *Studies*, 246–274 (258). See further L.B. Paton, *Esther* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1908), 30–31.

26 M. Hengel, *The ‘Hellenization’ of Judaea in the First Century after Christ* (London/Philadelphia: SCM/Trinity Press International, 1989), 24–25.

27 See Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 32–33 (note the subtitle of this monograph: “Sous l’influence du rabbinat palestinien”); Hengel, “*Hellenization*,” 25, referring also to Canticles and Lamentations (without arguments). K. Hyvärinen, *Die Übersetzung von Aquila* (ConBOT; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1977), 89–99 provides arguments against the assumption that Aquila had rendered this book, but in the case of the “LXX” of Ecclesiastes he assumes a “rabbinic recension.” Aquila was originally from Asia Minor (see Swete, *Introduction*, 31–33) and so was the historical Theodotion (see Swete, *ibid.*).

28 The first to recognize the connection between the *kaige*-Th sections in Samuel–Kings with Palestine was Thackeray, *Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, 17–18; idem, “The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings,” *JTS* 8 (1907): 262–278 (276–277). The main

- iv. The "LXX" of Canticles.²⁹
- v. The "LXX" of Lamentations.³⁰
- vi. The "LXX" of Ruth.³¹
- vii. Several scholars suggested that the Greek version of the Psalter originated in Palestine.³² Pointing out several characteristic *kaige*-Th equivalents in the OG Psalter, among them the rendering of כג and חא with καὶ γάρ,³³ Venetz claimed that that version, like the *kaige*-Th revision, originated in Palestine.³⁴ This view was accepted by van der Kooij who added the argument that the headings to Psalms 24 (23), 48 (47), 94 (93), 93 (92), 92 (91) reflect a Palestinian reading cycle for the days of the week also prescribed by *m. Tamid* 7.4 (with additional days of the week).³⁵ Schaper suggests that the Psalms were translated in Palestine in the second half of the second century BCE.³⁶ In spite of all this, in my view there are no convincing arguments in favor of a Palestinian origin of this book.³⁷

arguments were provided later by Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, *passim*; E. Tov, "The Methodology of Textual Criticism in Jewish Greek Scriptures, with Special Attention to the Problems in Samuel–Kings: The State of the Question: Problems and Proposed Solutions," in *Greek–Hebrew Bible*, 489–499. G. Dorival in Harl–Dorival–Munnich, *Septante*, 105 states that Thackeray and Barthélemy ascribe these sections to Alexandria, but Thackeray, *ibid.* actually ascribed the original translation to Alexandria and the revised sections (later named *kaige*-Th) to an "Asiatic-Palestinian school." Barthélemy only speaks about Palestine.

- 29 Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 33–34; M. Harl, "La version LXX du Cantique des Cantiques et le groupe Kaige-Théodotion: Quelques remarques lexicales," *Textus* 18 (1995): 101–120 ascribes this version to Theodotion.
- 30 Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 33–34; R. Schäfer in *BHQ*, Part 18, 19*.
- 31 Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 33–34.
- 32 H.J. Venetz, *Die Quinta des Psalteriums. Ein Beitrag zur Septuaginta- und Hexaplaforschung* (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1974), 80–84; A. van der Kooij, "On the Place of Origin of the Old Greek of Psalms," *VT* 33 (1983): 67–74.
- 33 For example, Ps 16 (15):6; 19 (18):12; 25 (24):3.
- 34 Venetz, *Quinta*, 80–84, emphasized greatly the Palestinian background of the noun βάρϰς. Venetz's assumption was preceded by Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 41–43.
- 35 A. Pietersma, "David in the Greek Psalms," *VT* 30 (1980): 213–226 (214) considers these subscriptions secondary, while van der Kooij maintains their original status.
- 36 J. Schaper, "Der Septuaginta-Psalter als Dokument jüdischer Eschatologie," in *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (ed. M. Hengel and M. Schwemer; WUNT 72; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 38–61.
- 37 See O. Munnich, "La LXX des Psaumes et le groupe *kaige*," *VT* 33 (1983): 75–89. For a summary of the counterarguments, see G. Dorival in Harl–Dorival–Munnich, *Septante*,

- viii. Wacholder extends the evidence relating to the Greek Esther (above, i) to 1 Esdras and Daniel. These three books may have been rendered by the same hand, or at least they may have belonged to the same literary circle.³⁸ This assumption is possible but has not been proven.³⁹
- ix. The slavishly literal LXX translation of 1 Maccabees may have been produced in Palestine.⁴⁰
- x. Judith and Tobit were ascribed to Palestine by Mussies and Hengel.⁴¹

Negative arguments relating to the assumption of an Egyptian origin are also relevant: The translation could not have been produced by local Egyptians, among whom the knowledge of Hebrew no longer existed.⁴² Further, the moving on from the translation of the Torah to that of the post-Pentateuchal books was not necessarily a natural step in Alexandria since the later books did not have the same authority as the Torah.⁴³ For example, in 50 BCE, Philo quoted mainly from the Torah and much less so from the post-Pentateuchal books,⁴⁴ because he commented mainly on the Torah.

104 and H. Gzella, "Die Wiege des griechischen David," in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter* (ed. E. Zenger; HBS 32; 2001), 19–47. Dorival remained undecided.

38 B.Z. Wacholder, *Eupolemus, A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature* (Cincinnati/New York/Los Angeles/Jerusalem: Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion, 1974), 279. Thus also Hengel, *Hellenization*, 25 (without arguments).

39 G. Dorival in Harl–Dorival–Munnich, *Septante*, 106 is undecided

40 Thus Bickerman, "Colophon," 357 = id., *Studies*, 240–241; G. Mussies, "Greek in Palestine and the Diaspora," in *The Jewish People in the First Century*, CRINT, Section Two, 2 (ed. S. Safrai and M. Stern; Assen and Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1976), 1040–1064 (1054); Hengel, *Hellenization*, 25 (both without arguments). Dorival in Harl–Dorival–Munnich, *Septante*, 105 is undecided.

41 Mussies, "Greek in Palestine," 1054 and Hengel, *'Hellenization'*, 25 (both without arguments). However, other scholars ascribe these books to Alexandria. See below.

42 The great majority of the synagogue and grave inscriptions as well as nearly all known proper names in Egypt are Greek; see W. Horbury & D. Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) and the Name Index in V.A. Tcherikover & A. Fuks, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* III (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964), 167–196. See further Hengel, *Septuagint*, 80.

43 Thus D. Barthélemy, "Pourquoi la Torah a-t-elle été traduite en grec?" in *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 21; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 322–340.

44 From a total of about 2050 Biblical references in Philo's writings, about 2000 pertain to the Torah and only about 50 to the other books, that is, a ratio of 40:1. See W.L. Knox, "A Note

In sum, the Palestinian participation in the creation of the LXX was significant enough for Wacholder in order to claim that “[i]t becomes clear then that the putative attribution of the Greek Bible exclusively to ‘Alexandrian’ translators is misleading, if not false.”⁴⁵

There seems to be less evidence⁴⁶ for the production of post-Pentateuchal translations in Egypt, in order of decreasing probability:⁴⁷

- i. The grandson of Ben Sira asserts that coming from Jerusalem to Egypt he translated there his grandfather’s book on behalf of those “living abroad” (Preface, 28, 34).⁴⁸
- ii. An Egyptian background of Isaiah has been suggested in detailed vocabulary studies by Ziegler, Seeligmann, and Troxel,⁴⁹ involving evidence from Egyptian papyri (see especially Ziegler’s analysis of the jewels in Isaiah 3).
- iii. McGlinchey pointed to words and ideas that in his view show the reliance of the LXX of Proverbs on ancient Egyptian wisdom, which could point to an Egyptian background of the translation.⁵⁰

on Philo’s Use of the Old Testament,” *JTS* 41 (1940): 30–34; F.H. Colson, “Philo’s Quotations from the Old Testament,” *JTS* 41 (1940): 237–251.

45 Wacholder, *Eupolemos*, 276.

46 The list of probable Alexandrian books given by G. Dorival in Harl–Dorival–Munnich, 105–107 is somewhat exaggerated. For example, J.A.L. Lee, *A. Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SCS 14; Scholars Press: Chico, CA, 1983), 148 does not say that Judges is Alexandrian; Dorival does not provide real arguments in favor of the Alexandrian background of Jeremiah, Baruch, Epistle of Jeremiah, and Ezekiel.

47 There is no support for the assumption that the LXX was prepared in Leontopolis; see Wasserstein and Wasserstein, *Legend*, 12; Dorival in Harl–Dorival–Munnich, *Septante*, 102–103.

48 The Greek translator of Sir 50:27 refers to his grandfather as “Iesous son of Sirach, Eleazar the Hierosolymite,” but this indication of the author’s origin is found only in the LXX, and not in the corresponding Cairo Geniza Hebrew text.

49 J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATA XII, 3; Münster i. W.: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934), 175–212 (pp. 203–212 refer to Isaiah 3); Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 70–91; R.L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation, The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (JSJSup 124; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 1–72; G. Dorival in Harl–Dorival–Munnich, *Septante*, 107 is undecided.

50 J.M. McGlinchey, *The Teaching of Amen-em-Ope and the Book of Proverbs* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1939), 17–19, 28 reviewed critically by G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint*, III. *Proverbs* (LUA NF I, 52, 3; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1956), 8.

- iv. On the basis of several equivalents, Thackeray,⁵¹ Gerleman,⁵² and Allen⁵³ claim that the Greek translation of Chronicles displays Alexandrian characteristics.⁵⁴
- v. The Minor Prophets, as suggested by Thackeray.⁵⁵
- vi. 3 Maccabees.⁵⁶
- vii. 2 Maccabees written in Greek.⁵⁷
- viii. The Wisdom of Solomon as suggested by Larcher.⁵⁸
- ix. Daniel as suggested by Eissfeldt.⁵⁹
- x. Tobit as suggested by Festugière.⁶⁰

Summarizing this section, it seems that a better case can be made for a Palestinian than an Egyptian background of most post-Pentateuchal books.⁶¹ At the

51 Thackeray, "Kings."

52 G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint*, II. *Chronicles* (LUÅ NF I, 43, 3; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1946), 14–21.

53 Most of Gerleman's examples, some of them first suggested by Thackeray, were strengthened by L.C. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles*, I–II (VTSup 25, 27; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974), I.21–23. The most telling examples are διαδοχοι and φίλοι (Ptolemaic court titles), ιερὸν (temple), παστοφόριον (= לשכה), and ὑπομνηματογράφος (= מזכיר), as well as the names of two African peoples.

54 On the other hand, Hengel, *Hellenization*, 25 (without arguments) considers this book to be Palestinian.

55 Thackeray, *Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, 13, 28.

56 See E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (175 B.C.–A.D. 135), *A New English Version Revised and Edited by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Martin Goodman* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1986), III.i.537–542; G. Dorival in Harl–Dorival–Munnich, *Septante*, 105.

57 For a thorough analysis, see Schürer, *History*, III.i.531–537.

58 G. Larcher, *Le Livre de la Sagesse ou la sagesse de Salomon* (Paris: Gabalda, 1983) [*non vidi*].

59 Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, 704: "That of Daniel is almost a paraphrase rather than a translation, and in fact in general G is in many respects more a witness to the exegesis of the Hebrew text reflecting Egyptian conditions and very Greek in spirit, than a testimony to the text itself." He quotes G. Bertram, "Die religiöse Umdeutung altorientalischer Lebensweisheit in der griechischen Übersetzung des ATs," *ZAW* 54 (1936): 153–167. However, this study merely refers to the change from oriental to Hellenistic terminology and ideas and not to its possible Alexandrian background. See further R. Marcus, "Jewish and Greek Elements in the Septuagint," *L. Ginzberg Jubilee Volume* (New York: The American Academy for Jewish Research, 1945), I.227–245.

60 A.-J. Festugière, *Les romans juifs: Tobit, Judith, Esther, Jonas* (Apt: Morel, 1976) [*non vidi*]. Dorival in Harl–Dorival–Munnich, 106 is undecided.

61 Thus Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 274–279 ("Judaean Part in the Making of the Septuagint")

same time, Hengel concludes that "it is not so simple to distinguish between the 'Jewish-Hellenistic literature of the Diaspora' and the 'genuine Jewish literature' of Palestine."⁶²

Thinking along modern thought patterns, one wonders whether there was any cooperation between the two centers. In those days a bi-national cooperation enterprise seems unlikely,⁶³ so we are left with the assumption that the translation enterprise was either mainly Palestinian or mainly Egyptian. The people involved were either Jewish sages residing in Palestine or learned men who traveled from Palestine to Egypt for this express purpose. These two options are not mutually exclusive, as the post-Pentateuchal translations may have been produced at different places on which we shall say more below.

We have evidence for the temporary move of at least the translator of Ben Sira from Palestine to Egypt in order to translate his grandfather's book. Wacholder extends this assumption to Esther, and in the wake of these two books he suggests: "It is likely that Lysimachus of Jerusalem, to whom the Greek Esther is attributed, and Ben Sira's grandson, who translated Ecclesiasticus, were typical; and that the work was usually done by men who had resided both in Jerusalem and in Egypt."⁶⁴ Larcher extended this view to Wisdom, translated by an Alexandrian Jew of Palestinian origin.⁶⁵ Also this assumption is unlikely. There is no proof of the move of translators to Egypt like in a modern cultural exchange program although there must have been close cultural ties between the communities of Palestine and Egypt. With the completion of the translation of most books in Palestine and some in Egypt, two groups of books were created that somehow were combined or viewed as one group. Possibly this process took place in Egypt, which had a larger Greek-speaking community than the land of Israel. However, it is not impossible that they were combined in Palestine.

and previously M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism, Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 100–102 based on his *Judentum und Hellenismus* (WUNT 10; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1969), 186–190.

62 Hengel, *Hellenization*, 26.

63 On the other hand, Wacholder, *Eupolemos*, 276 believes in collaboration: "A reasonable solution may be that the Septuagint represented a work of collaboration between the two main centers of third century Judaism." However, this idea is not supported by any evidence.

64 Wacholder, *Eupolemos*, 278–279.

65 Thus also G. Dorival in Harl–Dorival–Munnich, *Septante*, 108.

There is not much evidence on the origin of the post-Pentateuchal translations, and in order to be in a better position to evaluate the evidence for either Palestine or Egypt, the Greek language of Palestine needs to be contrasted with that of Egypt. However, this approach may not be very fruitful since possibly the Greek of the two countries differed little. Since we happen to know more about the language of Egypt, we are more easily inclined to ascribe LXX words to an Egyptian background, and by doing so we could create a wrong impression.⁶⁶ Little linguistic material has been collected that pertains only to the post-Pentateuchal books. I refer to some studies by Ziegler on Isaiah and by Jacob and Bickerman on Esther (see n. 25). Most lexicographical studies refer to the LXX books *en bloc*, such as the valuable lexicographical studies by Passoni del Acqua (n. 21) that do not advance our understanding of the individual post-Pentateuchal books. Nor do the studies that focus on the lexicographical Egyptian background of the Torah.⁶⁷

The analysis of the place of origin of the individual Septuagintal books runs parallel to that of the collection as a whole, especially the question of whether or not it reflects a so-called Alexandrian canon. The common view that the LXX reflects such a canon is difficult from the outset because it is very unlikely that a Diaspora community that had to rely on Palestinian translators would have been sophisticated enough to have its own tradition on the scope of its sacred writings in the second century BCE. Besides, the Greek books themselves are linked more to Palestine than Egypt. The main argument in favor of an Alexandrian canon seems to be the fact that that country had a greater Greek-speaking Jewish community than did Palestine. The idea of an Alexandrian

66 Thus J.A.L. Lee (private communication, January 2008). To give an example, Lee describes the background of the verbs for command in the Greek Torah against the background of the vocabulary of Ptolemaic Egypt, but he might have reached a similar conclusion for Palestine had we possessed better sources for that region: "A *Lexical Study* Thirty Years on, With Observations on 'Order' Words in the LXX Pentateuch," in Paul, *Emanuel*, 512–524.

67 Thus, in certain technical areas (irrigation, administration, clothing), the terminology of the Greek Torah is probably typically Egyptian. For example, שקל כסף was rendered in Gen 23:15 with διδραχμον ἀργυρίου, the local currency in Hellenistic Egypt. Further, words with the compound ἀρχι-, especially such professions as τοπάρχης—פקיד (Gen 41:34 and beyond), ἀρχιδεσμοφύλαξ—שר בית הסהר (Gen 39:21–23), etc. are known from Egypt. See Rösel, *Genesis*, 243. The ἐργασίωται used for נגשים (taskmasters) of Exod 3:7; 5:6–13 are also known from Egyptian papyri.

canon was rejected by Sundberg in a very impressive study⁶⁸ that has convinced many scholars.⁶⁹

3 The Nature of the Translation Enterprise

Probably the most pervasive influence from the Epistle of Aristeas on the understanding of the post-Pentateuchal books relates to the nature of the undertaking. In the minds of many scholars, the translations of these books were produced as official projects, like that of the Torah. Thackeray reflects this view when describing the translation of the Prophets as a “semi-official production” produced by a “second company, analogous to the pioneering body responsible for the Greek Pentateuch.”⁷⁰ In his view, yet another company produced the books of the Kingdoms.⁷¹ However, there is no proof that these books were rendered by groups of translators, and our first choice should be the assumption that each book was rendered by a different translator. The individual books assigned to the revisional activity of *kaige*-Th (see § 2 above) come closest to the perception of a group, but even here different individuals were involved. On the other hand, the translations of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Minor Prophets have in many ways a common vocabulary,⁷² which may well point to a single translator for all three books.

We need not think in terms of projects, neither with regard to the Torah nor the post-Pentateuchal books. Scholars are unconsciously influenced by modern parallels involving such parameters as official beginnings and endings of

68 A. Sundberg, *The Old Testament of the Early Church* (HTS 20; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964) updated by idem, “The Septuagint: The Bible of Hellenistic Judaism,” in *The Canon Debate* (ed. L. McDonald and J.A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 68–90. The kernel of Sundberg’s ideas was foreshadowed by P. Katz, “The Old Testament Canon in Palestine and Alexandria,” *ZNW* 47 (1956), 191–217.

69 See, e.g., G. Dorival in Harl–Dorival–Munnich, *Septante*, 112–119; R. Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and its Background in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986), 382–386; Hengel, *Septuagint*, 20. For a review of the literature, see J. Lust, “Septuagint and Canon,” in *The Biblical Canons* (ed. J.M. Auwers & H.J. de Jonge; BETL 163; Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 2003), 39–55.

70 Thackeray, *The Septuagint*, 13, 28–29.

71 This translation was produced in Egypt.

72 See Tov, *Jeremiah–Baruch*, 135–155. Likewise, the following groups of books may have been rendered by one individual each: 1Maccabees–1Esdras–Daniel, Job–Proverbs. See G. Dorival in Dorival–Harl–Munnich, *Septante*, 108.

projects, cooperation, and quality control. However, none of these descriptions pertain to the ancient translators. If the translation of the Torah was created within an official project, some form of cooperation between translators may be assumed. However, there is sufficient evidence to show that the translation of the five books of the Torah was performed by five translators⁷³ who did not revise their work.⁷⁴ Even more so in the case of the post-Pentateuchal books, it is likely that they represent one-time translations that were not revised subsequently by the original translators or others. This assumption provides the best explanation for the frequent mistakes in the understanding of grammar, words, and contexts that were not corrected subsequently.⁷⁵ Each translator followed his own systems and used his own vocabulary⁷⁶ and there is no proof of cooperation between the translators although sometimes clusters of books display shared equivalents, such as פלשתיים—ἀλλόφυλοι from Judges onwards as opposed to Φυλιστιναιμ in the Greek Torah. In any event, cooperation would have been difficult if these translations were produced at different times in different localities. Only in the case of the Greek Torah may we assume influence of its vocabulary on that of the later books.⁷⁷

73 Thus Hayeon Kim, *Multiple Authorship of the Septuagint Pentateuch*, Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 2007.

74 This supposition is supported by cases such as the rendering of *mittah* “bed,” a relatively rare word in Late Hebrew that was not understood by the translator of Genesis. This translator identified מטה as *matteh* in 47:31 (“staff”—ῥάβδος as in the earlier contexts Gen 38:18, 25), thus creating an unusual context: “Then Israel bowed at the head of the bed (*NJPS*)”—“and Israel did obeisance at the top of his staff (*NETS*).” Two verses later (48:2) as well as in 49:33 the translator correctly identified this word as “bed” (κλίνη), but he did not correct the earlier incorrect renderings of this word. See J. Barr, “Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew among the Ancient Translators,” *VTSup* 16 (1967), 1–11 (3). By the same token, transliterations of unknown Hebrew words, such as כברת—χαβραθα in Gen 35:16; 48:7 and המהבר—τὸ μαχμα in 2 Kgs 8:15, were not replaced by Greek equivalents. See my study “Loan-words, Homophony and Transliterations in the Septuagint,” in *Greek–Hebrew Bible*, 165–182.

75 See my study “Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?” in *Greek–Hebrew Bible*, 203–218.

76 For an example of such translator independence note the occurrence of λοιμοί only from 1 Sam 1:16 onwards as “pestilent,” “pestilence”. πατριάρχης (patriarch) occurs for the first time in Chronicles, although the Hebrew equivalent, ‘chief of clan’, occurred often in the earlier books.

77 See the study quoted in n. 16.

4 Heterogeneity of Greek Scripture

When reviewing the nature of the collection of Greek Scripture, we are struck by its heterogeneous character. Presumably this situation was caused by lack of planning at all stages of the enterprise, including the choice of the Hebrew base texts and that of the composition of the archetype of the canonical collection, and is best visible in the post-Pentateuchal books. In my opinion, from a *textual* point of view, the choice of the Greek texts included in this collection is coincidental,⁷⁸ like that in the Hebrew collection, since the contents of these collections were not planned in the modern sense of the word. The different books of Greek Scripture are early and late, original (OG) and revisional, very literal and extremely free. In my view, the major reason for this diversity is connected to the fact that these collections were composed by the assembling of Greek scrolls, small and large, of a different nature and background, the background of which is explained in chapter 2 in this volume.

5 Gradual Development of the Collection of Translations?

Scholars usually assume that the collection of LXX translations grew gradually,⁷⁹ but very little is actually known about this assumed process. Various questions come to mind. Was there an organizational force at work through the decades or at any given moment? Was the translation of the canonical books assigned to certain individuals or did these individuals embark on the translation project on their own initiative? Some books may have originated in Alexandria and others in Palestine, but we did not find any proof of collaboration between the two centers. Nevertheless, almost by necessity there must have been a main center for these translation efforts; how else could the simultaneous preparation of two different translations of the same book be avoided?⁸⁰ The existence of competing translations of the same book cannot be excluded, but there is no evidence for such an assumption. Some decisions must have been made on matters of principle. Thus, the translator of Jeremiah, who rendered not only the fifty-two chapters of that book, but also

78 See chapter 2 in this volume.

79 For example, Thackeray, *Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, 13: "Thus, it seems was the Alexandrian Bible gradually built up."

80 I refer to translations made directly from the originals, not to translations based on other ones, such as was probably the case with the Codex Barbarini of Habakkuk 3.

the little book of Baruch,⁸¹ must have relied on a decision or tradition of some kind.

The very fact that these books were rendered into Greek does not necessarily imply that at the time of the translation the Hebrew books themselves had been accepted as binding, but it is rather likely. Other Hebrew books were also translated into Greek, namely Enoch and Jubilees, but at a later period, in the first centuries of the common era.

Beyond the lack of planning that is visible in the heterogeneous character of Greek Scripture reflected in the different translation styles (see below), there are some signs of an overall design at the final stage. There must have been an overarching plan to include translations of at least all the canonical books in the corpus of sacred Greek Scripture. One need not assume that this principle guided the creation of the translation efforts from the beginning of the rendering of the post-Pentateuchal books, but it was effective when the Greek Torah was finished. Schenker⁸² surmised that such an unusually free translation technique as applied to Job would not have been used for one of the earlier books. I agree. Possibly a hesitation regarding the translation and its style is reflected in the relatively long interval between the translation of the Torah and that of the following books, probably no less than 100 years.⁸³

As a result, both planning, and more so, lack of it characterize the collection of Greek Scripture. The latter feature is revealed in the fact that books of a different nature appear side by side. Thus the translation of Joshua is often free, while that of its neighbor Judges, in both the A and B texts, is rather faithful to its underlying Hebrew text. It is remarkable that the same types of approach visible in the aforementioned translations of the historical books are recognizable in the versions of the Major Prophets. Thus, the versions of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Minor Prophets are rather literal, while the translation of Isaiah is free and in places very free. The book of Psalms is presented in a very literal Greek version, while the now adjacent translations of Job and Proverbs are very free and paraphrastic.⁸⁴

The collection did not necessarily grow in the book sequence of the present Greek or Hebrew canon. Usually, it is assumed that the five books of the Torah

81 See Tov, *Jeremiah–Baruch*.

82 Personal communication, 2008.

83 For a summary of the dates assigned to the books, see G. Dorival in Dorival–Harl–Munnich, *Septante*, 96–98.

84 For an attempt at explanation, see my study “Approaches towards Scripture Embraced by the Ancient Greek Translators,” in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 325–338.

were rendered sequentially, but this assumption is not necessary if they were rendered by five different translators.⁸⁵ For example, according to den Hertog, the translators of Leviticus and Numbers used an existing translation of Deuteronomy.⁸⁶ Likewise, the present formulation of Genesis constitutes such a finished literary product that it may not have stood at the beginning of the translation activity.⁸⁷ Indeed, Barr expressed an opinion⁸⁸ that the translation of Isaiah preceded that of the Torah because of the lack of consistent translation approach in the Greek translation of Isaiah. On the other hand, Rösel reflects the *communis opinio* that Genesis was the very first translation produced.⁸⁹ Without specific arguments, Tilly assumed that the translation of the Major Prophets preceded that of the other post-Pentateuchal books.⁹⁰ The post-Pentateuchal books could have been prepared in any sequence, certainly if they were produced in different centers.

6 The Hebrew Text Underlying the LXX

It remains very relevant to find out whether we can pinpoint features of the biblical texts rendered into Greek. This issue is all the more pressing since scholars attach much importance to the argument that the *Vorlage* of the LXX is often better than MT and all other known texts. In my view, the texts underlying the LXX are often older than MT and/or they came from circles different from those that came to be included in MT.⁹¹ Within the present context it is important to note that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX does not

85 Thus Hayeon Kim, *Multiple Authorship*.

86 C.G. den Hertog, "Erwägungen zur relativen Chronologie der Bücher Levitikus und Deuteronomium innerhalb der Pentateuchübersetzung," in *Brennpunkt* 2, 216–228.

87 See my study "Studies in the Vocabulary of the Septuagint: The Relation between Vocabulary and Translation Technique," *Tarbiz* 47 (1978): 120–138 (Heb. with Eng. summ.; German summary in *Hebräische Beiträge zur Wissenschaft des Judentums deutsch angezeigt* 1 [Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider, 1985], 148). F. Polak, "Context Sensitive Translation and Parataxis in Biblical Narrative," in Paul, *Emanuel*, 525–539 shows how from the beginning of Genesis the translator distinguished, however hesitantly, between καὶ and δέ, the latter particle setting off the new unit from the preceding one.

88 J. Barr, "Did the Greek Pentateuch Really Serve as a Dictionary for the Translation of the Later Books?" in Muraoka, *Hamlet*, 523–543 (539).

89 Rösel, *Übersetzung*, 10, 142, 257. See also chapter 33 in this volume.

90 M. Tilly, *Einführung in die Septuaginta* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005), 52.

91 Tov, "Large-Scale Differences."

reflect an Egyptian text-type,⁹² and therefore this Hebrew text is irrelevant to an analysis of the background of the post-Pentateuchal translations.

In sum, in our analysis of the question “What *is* the LXX?” we focused on the post-Pentateuchal books. We discussed the Jewish nature of the translation, the place of origin of the individual translation units, the nature of the translation enterprise, the heterogeneity of Greek Scripture, and the possibility of a gradual development of the collection of translations. External data about the LXX are scanty, and an internal analysis does not lead us very far. In my view, the research of the post-Pentateuchal books is too much influenced by that of the Torah and the Epistle of Aristee that does not refer to the post-Pentateuchal books. The collection of Greek translations is very diverse, and each book was created by a different individual, although some of them rendered more than one book. We should not think of the translation as an organized project, but probably more in terms of individual translations carried out without planning in Palestine and also in Egypt. Much coincidence was involved in the creation of the archetype of Jewish-Greek Scripture.

92 For an analysis, see *TCHB*, 139. If some or many of the translations were translated from Hebrew texts that came from Palestine sometimes together with the translators, we need not look for Egyptian features. Even if we assume that some of the texts were transmitted or formulated in Egypt, we have not discovered any Egyptian traits in these underlying Hebrew *Vorlagen*. The difficulty is apparent in Jeremiah, since the very different Hebrew text underlying the LXX was also found in Palestine, at Qumran, in the form of 4QJer^{b,d}. How could the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Greek translation be typical of Egypt if this text was also found at Qumran?

The Septuagint between Judaism and Christianity

1 Background

The Septuagint is or was sacred for Jews and Christians alike and the present study deals with both the Jewish and Christian aspects of that translation, trying to define what is Jewish and what is Christian. At one time, the Greek translation was considered to be inspired Scripture by both Jews and Christians, but now it is sacred only for the Eastern Orthodox Church, while it still has an important, though not canonical, position within Christianity. Of course, the Septuagint is not the only Scripture text claimed by more than one religious group. The *Hebrew Bible* or Old Testament is Holy Writ for Jews and Christians alike,¹ and the Syriac Peshitta is shared by several closely related religious groups, the Arameans, Assyrians, Chaldeans, Maronites, and Melkites.² On the other hand, the Samaritans do not share their sacred writings with any other group.

The Septuagint is a special case. A statement referring to the Septuagint as both Jewish and Christian would be imprecise, since the LXX was never both Jewish and Christian at the same time. The translation started off as a Jewish enterprise, and was accepted by the early Christians when they were still a group within Judaism. From that time onwards, when the Jews had abandoned the LXX, Christianity held on to the LXX as Scripture until the time of the Vulgate when that version became determinative for the Western Church some time after its creation. The canonical approach of the Roman-Catholic Church is determined by the medieval manuscripts of the Vulgate, which accepted the inclusion of most deuterocanonical books as inspired apocryphal works, while omitting other ones, and thus differing in some details from the canon of the LXX.³ The Reformation brought about a return to the combined

-
- 1 All modern Christian translations, except for those of the Orthodox Church, are based on MT, with a sprinkling of readings from the other versions.
 - 2 See the edition by G.M. Lamsa, *The Holy Bible from Ancient Eastern Manuscripts Containing the Old and New Testaments Translated from the Peshitta, The Authorized Bible of the Church of the East* (Nashville: Holman Bible Publishers, 1957). If the Peshitta, or its underlying text, ever had a status in Judaism it was in the distant past; presently it is known only as a Christian source.
 - 3 For example, the Vulgate lacks Psalm 151, it combines Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah as “Baruch,” and it does not include 1 Esdras and 3–4 Maccabees.

canonical approach of inspired Hebrew Scripture and the “outside books” of the Apocrypha as included in the LXX. At an earlier stage Judaism had changed its approach towards the Jewish-Greek translation, when the Jews turned their back to the LXX in the pre-Christian period, and to an even greater extent after the rise of Christianity. Already in the first century BCE it was realized that the Greek translation did not reflect the Hebrew Bible current in Palestine, that is, the text that later became the MT and at that time, the process of revision of the LXX, also named OG,⁴ towards the proto-Masoretic Text started to take shape.

In the first century CE, when the NT writers quoted the earlier Scripture, they used the wording of the LXX. That was a natural development since the NT was written in Greek, and under normal circumstances its authors would quote from earlier Scripture written in the same language.⁵

At the same time, as a result of abandoning the Jewish-Greek translation by Jews in the first centuries CE, that translation was held in contempt in its own environment in spite of its being a Jewish biblical version.⁶ As the reason for the contempt, the post-Talmudic tractate Soferim states (*Sof.* 1.7):

מעשה בחמשה זקנים שכתבו לתלמי המלך את התורה יוונית והיה היום קשה לישראל כיום
שנעשה בו העגל שלא הייתה התורה יכולה להתרגם כל צרכה

It happened once that five elders wrote the Torah for King Ptolemy in Greek, and that day was as ominous for Israel as the day on which the golden calf was made,⁷ since the Torah could not be accurately translated.⁸

4 In modern research, a distinction is made between the “LXX” as a general appellation of Greek Scripture and the “OG” as the oldest (reconstructed) form of the Greek translation, as opposed to its later revisions.

5 Thus M. Müller, *The First Bible of the Church: A Plea for the Septuagint* (JSOTSup 206; Copenhagen International Seminar 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 98: “To Paul and other New Testament authors, it <the LXX> appears to have been the obvious choice.”

6 See E. Tov, “The Evaluation of the Greek Scripture Translations in Rabbinic Sources,” in idem, *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 365–377; A. Schenker, “Pourquoi le Judaïsme s’est-il désintéressé de la Septante au début de notre ère?” in *Les dernières rédactions du Pentateuque, de l’Hexateuque et de l’Enneateuque* (ed. T. Römer and K. Schmid; BETL 203; Leuven/Paris/Dudley, MA: University Press/Peeters, 2007), 255–268.

7 The translation of the Torah “for King Ptolemy” is described as idolatry, probably because it was made for a heathen. Furthermore, the strong condemnation of the translation stands in great contrast to the annual festivities instituted for the same translation according to the Epistle of Aristea, §180.

8 The latter part of this statement in the post-Talmudic tractate removed two crucial words from the earlier dictum of *y. Meg.* 1:11 (71c) שאין התורה יכולה להתרגם כל צרכה אלא יוונית (the Torah could be accurately translated only in Greek).

According to this tradition, the Torah, like the Koran, is untranslatable, and only the Hebrew source text should be considered binding. At the same time, this argument was not used for the Aramaic Targumim. In many ways, the exegetical deviations from MT in some Targumim were much greater than those in the LXX, but they were considered in-house products of the Rabbis, for which rabbinic literature often used the phrase מתרגמין, “we translate.”⁹ Jewish discontent with the LXX¹⁰ went as far as prompting the institution of a day of mourning for that translation, an enterprise that was, at least according to tradition, initiated by the High Priest Eleazar himself. The instruction of the *Megillat Ta’anit Batra* to fast on the 8th of Tevet,¹¹ which was canceled in the Middle Ages, reminded religious Jews of the distortions of Hebrew Scripture by the ancient Greek translators.

New Greek translations adapted the OG translation to the Hebrew text then current in Palestine and because of their correcting nature these translations are usually named “revisions.”¹² Whether or not rabbinic Judaism *officially* rejected the LXX is unclear, but it was definitely disregarded¹³ since the rabbis did not quote from it. It should be admitted, however, that the other versions are not quoted much either; there are only a few references to Aquila in rabbinic literature (not in the Bab. Talmud) and to Targum Onkelos and Jonathan in the later rabbinic literature¹⁴ (not in the literature of the Tannaim). From

9 E.g. *b. Shabb.* 10b (Deut 7:9); 64a (Num 31:50); *b. Gittin* 68b (Lev 11:13).

10 Because of the contempt for the Seventy-Two translators, they are described in rabbinic literature as misrepresenting the content of the Hebrew Torah in 10–18 details. The list itself is fanciful and unrealistic, but it shows that rabbinic Judaism felt the need to indicate that the LXX actually misrepresented Hebrew Scripture. See Tov, “Evaluation.” This understanding is not shared by G. Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmi: Untersuchungen zum Übersetzungsverständnis in der jüdisch-hellenistischen und rabbinischen Literatur* (TSAJ 41; Tübingen: Mohr, 1994), 16–18.

11 See Tov, “Evaluation,” 366.

12 The main revisions known are those of *kaige*-Th (an anonymous revision, named *kaige*, probably produced at the beginning of the first century BCE and continued by Theodotion towards the end of the first century CE), Aquila (active around 125 CE), and Symmachus (end of the second century CE). Origen included these revisions in his monumental six-column Hexapla edition of Hebrew and Greek Scripture in the middle of the third century CE. Our understanding of the relation between these versions and the OG is much indebted to the revolutionary study of Barthélemy, *Devanciers*.

13 On the other hand, Veltri suggested that when the rabbinic traditions are properly analyzed, they do not provide evidence for such an approach. See Veltri, *Eine Tora, passim*, especially 215–219.

14 Some evidence has been collected by E.Z. Melamed, *Bible Commentators* (Heb.; Jerusalem:

the end of the first century CE onwards, the LXX ceased to be influential in Judaism.¹⁵

2 The LXX as a Jewish Translation

The Jewish origin of the LXX is described in the Epistle of Aristeas, rabbinic literature, and various additional sources. For example, an early source like the Epistle of Aristeas stressed the fact that the High Priest, Eleazar, who sent scrolls from Jerusalem to Egypt to be translated, guided the translation.¹⁶ Such was also the message of rabbinic literature, in which, however, the High Priest is not mentioned. The Jewish nature of the LXX is reflected in its terminology and exegesis.¹⁷ Several Hebrew words were preserved in the LXX in their Hebrew or Aramaic form (at the time of the translation, Aramaic was more commonly spoken by Jews than Hebrew). Some Hebraized Greek words in the LXX probably reflect Aramaic forms, such as *σάββατα* (שבתא) and *Πασχα* (פסחא). The Greek Torah reflects neologisms in the Greek language that are meant to represent some of the special Jewish customs or terms, such as the names of the festivals, and Jewish concepts (e.g. *גר*—*γείωρας*) for which no words existed in the Greek language. Thus, *ὅλοκαύτωμα* (“whole-burnt offering”) was probably coined to reflect the special meaning of the *עולה* offering, and *ἀγιαστήριον* was meant to reflect *מקדש*. Further, the translators tried to differentiate between the Jewish and non-Jewish use of some central religious words. Thus, the Greek Torah made a distinction between two types of “altar” (מזבח), a Jewish one rendered *θυσιαστήριον*, and a pagan altar rendered *βωμός*.¹⁸ The translators also

Magnes, 1975), 1.141–143. Other evidence, less clearly visible because it is at variance with Targum Jonathan on the Prophets, has been collected by M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, *Fragments of Lost Targumim* (Heb.; 2 vols.; Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1983, 1989). See also H. Sysling, “Three Harsh Prophets: A Targumic *Tosefta* to *Parashat Korah*,” *Aramaic Studies* 2 (2004): 223–242 (224, n. 7).

15 At the literary level, one of the last signs of the influence of the LXX was its central position in the writings of Josephus at the end of the first century CE.

16 §310–311. The various sources of this tradition, mainly Christian, have been collected by P. Wendland, *Aristeae ad Philocratem Epistula cum ceteris de origine versionis LXX interpretum testimoniis* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1900); H.St.J. Thackeray, *The Letter of Aristeas, Translated with an Appendix of Ancient Evidence on the Origin of the Septuagint* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1918).

17 See my study “Studies in the Vocabulary of the Septuagint: The Relation between Vocabulary and Translation Technique,” *Tarbiz* 47 (1978): 120–138 (Heb. with Eng. summ.).

18 The Aramaic Targumim likewise distinguished between the Jewish *מזבחא* and the pagan

preferred to use εἰδωλον for אֱלֹהִים (הים) rather than θεός when referring to a non-Jewish God.

Jewish exegesis is visible wherever a special interpretation of the LXX is paralleled by rabbinic literature.¹⁹ Such exegesis reveals the Palestinian background of some of the Pentateuch translators. For example, the “second tithe” in the LXX of Deut 26:12 (שְׁנַת הַמַּעֲשֵׂר MT, “the year of the tithe,” read as שְׁנַת הַמַּעֲשֵׂר, as if, “second, the tithe”) represents the rabbinic term מַעֲשֵׂר שְׁנִי (“second tithe”). Aptowitzer²⁰ and Prijs²¹ also provide examples for the post-Pentateuchal books, but the evidence is not impressive.

The LXX translation was a Jewish venture, created for Jews and probably also for Gentiles. The Greek Torah served as the base for the philosophical-exegetical works of Philo and the historical-exegetical writings of Josephus. This translation was probably used in Alexandria by Jews in their weekly ceremonial reading from the first century BCE onwards.²²

The Jewish background of the Greek translation of the Torah is well established, while that of the post-Pentateuchal books is not, although this assumption is almost certainly correct. We have little doubt that Jews translated these books in the third and second pre-Christian centuries. There probably were no Gentiles in Egypt or elsewhere who would have had the skills to make such a transcultural translation, or an incentive to do so.²³

3 The LXX and the NT

The LXX lost its central position in Judaism from the first century CE onwards (see § 1). Subsequently, this process was accelerated when that translation was

אגרא (literally “heap of stones”). See P. Churgin, “The Targum and the Septuagint,” *AJSLL* 50 (1993): 41–65.

19 For examples relating to the Torah, see Z. Frankel, *Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipzig: Barth, 1851); J. Fürst, “Spüren der palästinisch-jüdischen Schriftdeutung und Sagen in der Übersetzung der LXX,” *Semitic Studies in Memory of Rev. Dr. Alexander Kohut* (ed. G.A. Kohut; Berlin: S. Calvary, 1897), 152–166; Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition*; S. Safrai, “Halakha,” in *The Literature of the Sages*, CRINT, Section Two (ed. S. Safrai; Assen-Maastricht/Philadelphia: Fortress Press/Van Gorcum, 1987), 3.137–139. Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition*, xiii and 105 mentions additional literature published before 1948 on rabbinic exegesis.

20 V. Aptowitzer, “Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zu Septuaginta und Vulgata, I. Die Bücher Samuelis,” *ZAW* 29 (1909): 241–252.

21 Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition*, especially relating to Psalms and Proverbs.

22 See chapter 29, § 2 in this volume.

23 See chapter 29 in this volume.

used as the official source for Scripture in the writings of early Christianity. The Christians accepted the LXX as such, generally without changing its wording (see §3.2 below). At the same time, they inserted some changes in external features of Scripture: Christian scribes adopted the codex instead of the scroll²⁴ and they introduced abbreviations for the *nomina sacra* (ΚΣ, ΘΣ, ΧΣ, etc.).²⁵ Furthermore, Christian scribes sometimes added introductory and concluding comments to books as well as marginal notes, such as the identification in codex s of the supposed speakers in Canticles.²⁶ That these identifications are Christian can be discerned from the fact that in Cant 1:7 the figure of Jesus has been included, probably by the scribe of s and not by his Greek *Vorlage*.²⁷

24 For the tabulated data, see my *Scribal Practices*, Appendix 5. I quote from p. 303: “A major though not exclusive criterion for the Jewish nature of a text is the writing in scrolls ... (see already C.H. Roberts, “The Christian Book and the Greek Papyrus,” *JTS* 50 [1949]: 155–168, especially 157–158). The Christian nature of Scripture texts can usually be detected by their inscription in codex form ... and their use of abbreviated forms of the divine names.” See further R.A. Kraft, “The ‘Textual Mechanics’ of Early Jewish LXX/OG Papyri and Fragments,” in *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text* (ed. S. McKendrick and O.A. O’Sullivan; London: British Library and Oak Knoll Press in association with The Scriptorium: Center for Christian Antiquities, 2003), 51–72.

25 See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, *ibid.* Hengel, *Septuagint*, 41 suggests that the real distinction is between the use of $\chi\rho\iota\varsigma$ in Christian codices and paleo-Hebrew Tetragrammata in Jewish scrolls. However, the use of paleo-Hebrew for the divine names (or square script in the case of P. Fouad 266b [848] of Deuteronomy) may be a sign of early revisional activity and not of Jewish sources in general. Note further that 4QpapLXXLev^b uses ΙΑΩ. On the *nomina sacra*, see L. Traube, *Versuch einer Geschichte der christlicher Kürzung* (Munich, 1907; repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967); A.H.R.E. Paap, *Nomina Sacra in the Greek Papyrus of the First Five Centuries A.D.: The Sources and Some Deductions* (Leiden: Brill, 1959); K. Treu, “Die Bedeutung des Griechischen für die Juden im römischen Reich,” *Kairos* 15 (1973): 123–144.

26 See R.A. Kraft, “Christian Transmission of Greek Jewish Scriptures: A Methodological Probe,” in *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme: Influences et affrontements dans le Monde Antique* (Mélanges M. Simon) (ed. A. Benoit et al.; Paris: De Boccard, 1978), 207–226 (210, notes 13, 14), also: <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/gopher/other/journals/kraftpub/Transmission%20of%20Gk-Jewish%20Scriptures>.

27 See the detailed analysis by J.C. Treat, *Lost Keys: Text and Interpretation in Old Greek Song of Songs and Its Earliest Manuscript Witnesses*, Ph.D. Diss.; University of Pennsylvania, 1996, 379 (also: available in <http://philae.sas.upenn.edu/~jtreat/song/sinai.html>). By comparing the rubrics of codex s with those of Old Latin parallels, Treat establishes that the Christian references were lacking in s’s sources (pp. 481–490).

3.1 *Influence of the LXX on the NT*

The LXX influenced the NT at various levels because early Christianity adopted the LXX as its Scripture. Expressing himself in theological terms, Bertram stated that the LXX was a *praeparatio evangelica* for the NT, and in this regard Bertram followed in the footsteps of several Church Fathers.²⁸ The influence of the LXX is visible in the areas of the language, terminology, and theological foundations of the NT, as well as in its manifold quotations.

3.1.1 Language

The authors of the NT were influenced by Semitic diction in general²⁹ and by the language of the LXX specifically.³⁰ They thus absorbed the special phrases³¹ and vocabulary of that version. Of the typical LXX words and usages that were introduced in their new meaning in the NT, we mention: ἀδελφός (fellow man), δόξα (honor, glory),³² ἔθνη (other nations beside Israel), ἐπισκέπτομαι (to pay attention to), ἐρωτάω εἰς εἰρήνην (ask after [a person's] health = greet, salute).³³ Note further the following "Jewish" words mentioned in § 2: ὁλοκαύτωμα (whole-burnt offering), θυσιαστήριον (altar), προσήλυτος (prose-lyte), πατριάρχης (patriarch). In this category Turner³⁴ includes words that

28 G. Bertram, "Praeparatio evangelica in der Septuaginta," VT 7 (1967): 225–249 (249): "Vielmehr hat die Septuaginta unwillkürlich und ohne bewusste Arbeit der Übersetzer und Ausleger, ohne die Tätigkeit der Schriftgelehrten, die Voraussetzungen geschaffen für die Verbreitung der Botschaft des Neuen Testaments in der griechisch sprechenden Welt." For a discussion of this view in the Church Fathers, see D.K. Kranz, LC, "Vetera et Nova": *Zum inspirierten Status der Septuaginta aus Vergangenheit und Gegenwart, Excerpta ex Dissertatione ad Doctoratum in Theologia et Scientiis Patristicis* (Rome: Pontificia Universitas Lateranensis, 2007), 113–117.

29 See, for example, W.F.D. Sparks, "The Semitisms of St. Luke's Gospel," JTS 44 (1943): 129–138.

30 See especially H.A.A. Kennedy, *Sources of New Testament Greek or the Influence of the Septuagint on the Vocabulary of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1895); N. Turner, "Jewish and Christian Influence on New Testament Vocabulary," NT 16 (1974): 149–160; M. Harl in Harl–Dorival–Munnich, *Septante*, 280–281 (with bibliography).

31 See for example M. Johannesson, "Das biblische καὶ ἐγένετο und seine Geschichte," *Zeitschrift für die vergleichende Sprachforschung* 53 (1926): 161–212; idem, "Das biblische καὶ ἰδοὺ in der Erzählung samt seiner hebräischen Vorlage," *ibid.* 66 (1939): 145–195; 67 (1940): 30–84.

32 Cf. especially L.H. Brockington, "The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in δόξα," VT 1 (1951): 23–32.

33 Cf H.St.J. Thackeray, "A Study in the Parable of the Two Kings," JTS 14 (1912–1913): 389–399 on Luke 14:31.

34 Turner, "Jewish and Christian Influence."

are attested for the first time in the LXX, but were not necessarily coined by the translators, such as ἀγαθωσύνη (mainly equaling טובה) and ἀἵνεςις (mainly equaling תודה).

In other cases, the level of influence is more subtle. Thus, before the time of the LXX ἐξομολογέομαι was used mainly as “to confess,” and in this sense it was used in the LXX as a translation equivalent of הודה, “to confess.” However, the Hebrew verb denotes not only “to confess,” but also “to thank,” and several LXX translators who did not recognize the latter meaning, Hebraistically rendered both meanings of הודה with a single verb, ἐξομολογέομαι. This non-Greek use of ἐξομολογέομαι in the LXX as “to thank” was not natural in the Greek language, resulting from the artificial nature of the translation language. The verb, together with the related noun ἐξομολόγησις, became part and parcel of the NT language and early Christian literature, e.g. Matt 11:25 ... ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Ἐξομολογούμαι σοι, πάτερ κύριε του οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς = Luk 10:21. These new meanings in the Greek language directly derived from the LXX and Hebrew Scripture.³⁵

Likewise, the choice of σὰρξ (“flesh”) as the main equivalent of בשר was natural because of their similar meanings. However, the Greek word was used also for בשר when denoting “body” and even in the phrase כל בשר—“all living beings.”

3.1.2 Terminology³⁶

As an extension of the use of the LXX language in the NT, several LXX words became technical terms in the NT. Thus, χριστός, originally a Greek rendering of משיח (“the anointed”) became the central name of Christ. Likewise, Κύριος, used as a title for Christ, is Septuagintal. This divine epithet derives directly from the LXX, but Case suggested that the NT authors distinguished between the real God (θεός) and the appellation of Jesus, stressing “his heavenly authority over the community in the spiritual sphere.”³⁷ The various aspects in the description of the δόξα of God in the NT are based on the LXX, especially in the book of Isaiah.³⁸ ἄγγελος became “angel” in the LXX, and εὐαγγέλιον (2 Sam 4:10) became “gospel.”

35 For a detailed analysis, see my study “Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings,” in *Greek–Hebrew Bible*, 109–128.

36 See R.T. McLay, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2003), 146–148.

37 S.J. Case, “KYPIOΣ as a Title for Christ,” *JBL* 26 (1907): 151–161 (160). See further Harl in Harl–Dorival–Munnich, *Septante*, 283–284.

38 See Brockington, “Greek Translator.”

3.1.3 Theological Foundations³⁹

Quotations from the LXX in the NT are meant to prove that the message of Hebrew Scripture (mediated through its Greek translation) is being fulfilled in the new writings.⁴⁰ From the point of view of the NT, Hebrew Scripture as a whole is thus considered prophetic writing. Some of these quotations pertain to the NT's theological foundations, which are based on the exact wording of the LXX. Thus, the idea of the Messiah's birth to a παρθένος (Matt 1:23 and the parallel story in Luk 1:31, but not in Luk 2:7) is based on an idiosyncratic equivalent in the LXX of Isa 7:14 "Behold, a virgin shall conceive ..." (MT speaks of an הַמָּלֵא, a "young woman"). The LXX and NT texts are more or less identical: Isa 7:14 ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις (= Luk 1:31; Matt 1:23: καλέσουσιν) τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Εμμανουήλ (Luk 1:31: Ἰησοῦν and thus also Matt 1:21). In a way, it is not easy to prove the dependence of Matthew and Luke on the LXX of Isaiah, since most of their translation equivalents in this verse are common LXX renderings, but the use of παρθένος leaves no doubt that they quoted from the LXX as found in the uncial manuscripts.⁴¹ The LXX's equivalent is the more unusual in Isaiah as it is used in the context of childbirth, and it remains unclear why it was chosen. The LXX either reflects a contextual theological tendency in Isaiah, as claimed by Rösel,⁴² or its linguistic exegesis resembles that of the Greek translation of Gen 24:43.⁴³ In either case, the equivalent used by the

39 See McLay, *Septuagint*, 159–170.

40 Note the frequently used formula such as in Matt 1:22 τούτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος—All this took place to fulfill what had been spoken by the Lord through the prophet (*NRSV*). For the central status of the earlier Scripture for the new religion, see John 1:45, 5:46; 1 Cor 15:3.

41 In later times, this verse was to become one of the key arguments for the contention that the Jews falsified Scripture, see especially Justin Martyr, *Dialogue* 43:3–8, 66:2–4, 68:9, 71:3, 84:1; *Apologia* 1.33:1, 4–6. Justin defended the reading παρθένος, while rejecting the "Jewish" rendering νεάνις (= Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion) that, according to him, was doctored.

42 M. Rösel, "Die Jungfrauengeburt des endzeitlichen Immanuel," *JBTh* 6 (1991): 135–151 claims that this rendering does not reflect an isolated case of exegesis, but that all of Isaiah 7 in the LXX is colored by special salvation exegesis, and that in this detail the translator imitated the virgin birth of the Goddess Aion in Greek mythology.

43 In Genesis, עלמה is likewise rendered by παρθένος, but that equivalent depends on explicit statements in the context. In v. 16, Rebekah is described as both a נערה (girl) and a בתולה (virgin), while the LXX uses only one equivalent for both words in that verse (παρθένος). When we come to v. 43, the LXX makes a shortcut, and even though the Hebrew speaks about a young woman (עלמה), the translator remembered the words used for Rebekah in v. 16, and therefore calls the young woman who would address Abraham's servant a

Greek translator is understandable within its translation environment, but the influence of this innocent translation equivalent was to be of major importance for the new religion. Likewise, the special interpretation of the LXX version of the “servant of the Lord” as an eschatological savior in Isa 52:14–53:14, that was to be viewed later as Christological, was already foreshadowed in additional pre-Christian sources, among them Qumran fragments, as demonstrated by Hengel.⁴⁴

3.1.4 Quotations from the LXX in the NT

The main source of influence of the LXX on the NT is through its manifold quotations, especially from Isaiah, Psalms, and the Pentateuch,⁴⁵ directly influencing the language and terminology of the NT as described above. The quotations appearing in the NT elaborate on the Scripture text in different ways. When focusing on text-critical issues, we first have to deduct from the various differences between the quoted texts and the LXX all cases of free quotation and editorial changes by the NT authors, such as illustrated in detail by Koch for the Pauline Epistles.⁴⁶ The remaining differences may be subjected to text-critical discussion, to be analyzed together with the agreements with the LXX. The following questions will be posed:

1. Which NT compositions are closest to the LXX translation in their quotations?

παρθένος. It is not impossible, but probably a little far-fetched, to assume that the Greek translator of Isaiah was influenced by the Greek and Hebrew Genesis. For the influence of the Greek Pentateuch on the later Greek versions, see my study “The Impact of the LXX Translation of the Pentateuch on the Translation of the Other Books,” in *Greek–Hebrew Bible*, 183–194.

44 M. Hengel, “Zur Wirkungsgeschichte von Jes 53 in vorchristlicher Zeit,” in *Der leidende Gottesknecht, Jesaja 53 und seine Wirkungsgeschichte* (ed. B. Janowski and P. Stuhlmacher; FAT 14; Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 49–91.

45 See Swete, *Introduction*, 381–405; J. de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1965); M. Harl in Harl–Dorival–Munnich, *Septante*, 269–288; N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (tr. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 2000), 23–32; McLay, *Septuagint*, 148–158; J.M. Dines, *The Septuagint* (London/New York: T & T Clark, 2004), 142–144. See further the studies mentioned below and the many studies listed in Brock, *Bibliography*, 53–57; Dogniez, *Bibliography*, 73–82.

46 D.-A. Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums. Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (BHTh 69; Tübingen: Mohr, 1986), 102–198.

2. In the case of agreements of the quotations with the LXX, can we pinpoint a specific LXX manuscript tradition that is closer to the text quoted in the NT than the other LXX manuscripts?
3. Can we point to specific textual features (especially OG traditions versus early revisions) of the individual LXX books as quoted in the NT?

LXX specialists are interested in the following questions that are also important for NT studies:

- a. How should the relation between the quotation and the various representatives of Greek Scripture be determined? In such an analysis standard LXX equivalents, such as אָרָן = γῆ should be disregarded,⁴⁷ while unusual and idiosyncratic equivalents should be the basis for deciding on closeness between textual sources.
- b. Remarkably often the text quoted in the NT reflects the main LXX uncials, although we have no statistics for the NT as a whole. Closest to the wording of the LXX are probably the citations in the Gospel of John,⁴⁸ Luke-Acts,⁴⁹ and the Catholic Epistles as well as individual quotations in the other books.
- c. The text of these quotations is often close to codex A of the LXX or, more generally, Alexandrian witnesses.⁵⁰ Here, too, we have no exact statistics.
- d. Many NT quotations differing from the LXX are closer to MT than to the LXX ad loc. This situation is recognized especially when the LXX ad loc. differs from MT because of its different Hebrew *Vorlage* or its free translation character. In the case of the free translation of the LXX of Isaiah, we can rather easily recognize these relations. In such cases we can often identify the versions that are quoted in the NT, especially the *kaige*-Th revision preceding the writing of the NT books. This version revised the OG towards a literal representation of the Hebrew text then current in Israel (the proto-Masoretic

47 This point is made by Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 23.

48 See Menken, *Fourth Gospel*.

49 See C.R. Holladay, "Luke's Use of the LXX in Acts: A Review of the Debate and a Look at Acts 1:15–26"; A.M. Schwemer, "Lukas als Kenner der Septuaginta und die Rede des Stephanus (Apg 7,2–53)" in *Die Septuaginta und das frühe Christentum: The Septuagint and Christian Origins* (ed. T.S. Cauley & H. Lichtenberger; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 301–328.

50 W. Staerk, "Die alttestamentliche Citate bei den Schriftstellern des Neuen Testaments," *ZWT* 35 (1892): 461–485; 36 (1893) 70–98; 38 (1895): 218–230; Swete, *Introduction*, 395, 403 (both: codex A); K.J. Thomas, "The Old Testament Citations in Hebrews," *NTS* 11 (1965): 303–325 (manuscripts A and B); Koch, *Die Schrift*, 48–57 (Alexandrian witnesses in the case of Isaiah, codices F and A in the Pentateuch).

text), and later continued as the medieval MT. This line of research was initiated by Barthélemy within the realm of LXX studies,⁵¹ and was continued within NT studies by such scholars as Dietrich-Alex Koch, Menken, and Wilk.⁵² It is now clear that Matthew and Paul often quoted from *kaige*-Th and other revisions of the OG.⁵³ There is no reason to assume that Matthew or Paul themselves produced these literal translations, because the agreements between the quotations and known revisions such as *kaige*-Th are too obvious.⁵⁴

A well-known example of a quotation is the one from Isa 25:8 in 1 Cor 15:54 quoting not the LXX (κατέπιεν ὁ θανατὸς ἰσχύσας = MT בָּלַע הַמוֹת לְנֶצַח), but *kaige*-Th, κατεπόθη ὁ θανατὸς εἰς νίκης. The quotation reflects a variant reading of MT's vocalization בָּלַע (he devoured) as בָּלַע (was devoured), as well as a different etymological understanding of לְנֶצַח.

I have no exact statistical information as to which manuscript tradition prevailed in the quotations, that of the OG or of the revisions, but it seems that the LXX (OG) was quoted in most writings of the NT,⁵⁵ and that the use of an early Greek Scripture revision by Matthew and Paul, pertains to a minority of the quotations. The use of the LXX in the Apocalypse of John is *sui generis*.⁵⁶

51 Barthélemy, *Devanciers*.

52 Koch, *Die Schrift*; M.J.J. Menken, *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist* (BETL 173; Leuven/Paris/Dudley: University Press/Peeters, 2004); F. Wilk, "The Letters of Paul as Witnesses to and for the Septuagint Text," in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of Greek Jewish Scriptures* (ed. W. Kraus and R.G. Wooden; SCS 53; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 2005), 253–271.

53 For example, Wilk, "Letters of Paul," 264: "In twenty-one quotations ... Each time the Greek version seems to have been reworked to align it with the Hebrew text. Each time, again, this version concurs more or less with one of the translations done by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion." Koch provides different statistics (see n. 57).

54 This point is made by Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, 280 and *passim*.

55 Thus D.S. New, *Old Testament Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels and the Two-Document Hypothesis* (SCS 37; Atlanta, GA, 1993), 122–123; Thomas, "Old Testament Citations."

56 The Apocalypse is close to the LXX in most of its quotations that contain some idiosyncratic LXX renderings. See G.K. Beale, "A Reconsideration of the Text of Daniel in the Apocalypse," *Bib* 67 (1986): 539–543. See also L.P. Trudinger, "Some Observations Concerning the Text of the Old Testament in the Book of Revelation," *JTS* 17 (1966): 82–88 who stresses that the Apocalypse often reflects the Th-Daniel. See further the insightful paper of H. Lichtenberger, "Das Alte Testament in der Offenbarung des Johannes" in *Die Septuaginta und das frühe Christentum: The Septuagint and Christian Origins* (ed. T.S. Cauley & H. Lichtenberger; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 382–390.

- e. It remains intriguing that Paul used both the OG version and the *kaige*-Th revision for the same biblical book (Isaiah), apparently under the same conditions, and in the same Epistles (Romans, 1 Corinthians).⁵⁷ Paul likewise quotes from revisional texts in 1 Kings (3 Reigns) and Job,⁵⁸ but he quotes more frequently from the OG.⁵⁹ It seems to me that Paul quoted from different versions concurrently or possibly he revised some of his own writings according to different LXX manuscripts.⁶⁰

The case of Matthew's Bible is similar and different at the same time. Matthew reflects both the OG and an early revision, but these two sources probably derived from different layers of Matthew's compositional process. The quotations from the OG (such as Matt 3:3 // Mark 1:3 = Isa 40:3 LXX) in Mark and Luke derived from Mark and Q (Luke), and Matthew altered them only slightly, as shown by Menken.⁶¹ At the same time, the ten fulfillment prophecies in Matthew⁶² reflect a revised Greek text such as *kaige*-Th, in Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Minor Prophets, and the Psalms. According to Menken, this was Matthew's Bible that he must have known when he composed his Gospel in the last decades of the first century CE; on the other hand, the quotations from the LXX reflect Matthew's sources. Matthew himself thus did not use two different types of the Greek Bible, but he adhered to the Greek revised Bible text.⁶³

- f. The use of different Greek versions by the same authors reflects the textual situation in Palestine of that time, as known from the finds from the Judean Desert. From the first century BCE onwards there was an ever-growing discomfort with the LXX version because of its deviations from the Hebrew text then current in Palestine. Our major source of information for this develop-

57 The OG is reflected, among other things, in Isa 10:22 (Rom 9:27); 29:14 (1 Cor 1:19); 29:16 (Rom 9:20); 40:13 (Rom 11:34); 45:23 (Rom 14:11); 52:5 (Rom 2:24); 59:7 (Rom 3:15); 65:1–2 (Rom 10:20–21). Revisional texts are reflected in the following verses (for a thorough analysis, see Koch, *Die Schrift*, 59–83, who lists all the verses mentioned here): Isa 8:14 (Rom 9:33); 25:8 (1 Cor 15:54); 28:11 (1 Cor 14:21); 52:7 (Rom 10:15).

58 1 Kings 19:10 (Rom 11:3), 19:18 (Rom 11:4); Job 5:13 (1 Cor 3:19), 41:3 (Rom 11:35).

59 For some examples, see Koch, *Die Schrift*, 51–57.

60 This is one of the options mentioned by Wilk, "Letters," 267: "... either Paul's citations originated from at least three different versions of the Septuagint, or its revision toward the Hebrew had not been carried out consistently."

61 Menken, *Matthew's Bible*.

62 Matth 1:22–23 = Isa 7:14; 2:15 = Hos 11:1; 2:17–18 = Jer 31:15; 2:23 = Judg 13:5, 7; 4:14–16 = Isa 8:23–9:1; 8:17 = Isa 53:4; 12:17–21 = Isa 42:1–4; 13:35 = Ps 78:2; 21:4–5 = Zech 9:9; 27:9–10 = Zech 11:13.

63 Menken, *Matthew's Bible*, *passim*, and summary in pp. 280–283.

ment is the Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever from the first century BCE reflecting the *kaige*-Th revision. Barthélemy characterized this revision as *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, describing it as “précédée d’une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l’influence du rabbinat palestinien.” In the same Judean Desert we found other Greek fragments, at Qumran, this time reflecting the LXX version, probably even closer to the OG than the text of our main uncials.⁶⁴ Some of these Greek fragments are earlier than the Naḥal Ḥever scroll of the Minor Prophets (between the end of the 2nd century BCE to the beginning of the 1st century CE). These Greek fragments, found at different localities in the Judean Desert, thus reflect different socio-religious conditions paralleled by the Hebrew texts found in these localities. Both the Hebrew and Greek texts from Qumran reflect a community that practiced openness at the textual level and was not tied down to MT, while the other Judean Desert sites represent Jewish nationalistic circles that adhered only to the proto-rabbinic (proto-Masoretic) text in Hebrew and the Jewish revisions of the LXX towards that Hebrew text.⁶⁵

3.2 *Christian Corrections in the LXX Manuscripts?*

While the earliest manuscripts we have of Greek Scripture (such as those from the Judean Desert) were undoubtedly copied by Jews, the great majority of the manuscripts in our possession have been transmitted by Christians.⁶⁶ It is often claimed, on both a popular⁶⁷ and scholarly level, that the early Christians tampered with the text of the LXX in order to adapt it to their views. If such a process took place it would be understandable, since Christianity was in the very peculiar situation of being based on a Jewish source, the LXX. As parallels, one may invoke theological tampering with the text of NT manuscripts in the wake of doctrinal controversies, as described by Ehrman.⁶⁸ However, in the

64 See my study “The Greek Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert,” *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 339–364.

65 Ibid.

66 A large section of the monograph by Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint* is named “The Septuagint in Christian Tradition” (pp. 191–301).

67 L. Greenspoon, “‘Reclaiming’ the Septuagint for Jews and Judaism,” in *Scripture in Transition, Essays on the Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Rajja Sollamo* (ed. A. Voila and J. Jokiranta; JSJSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 661–670.

68 B.D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

area of Hebrew Scripture and its translations, such tampering with the text is surprisingly rare. As far as we know, the Qumran biblical scrolls contain no sectarian readings,⁶⁹ which is remarkable in view of the fact that sectarian Qumran scribes probably copied one-third of these scrolls.⁷⁰ The evidence for Pharisaic reworking of MT is very limited, except for the MT of Samuel.⁷¹ By the same token, after the initial sectarian creation of SP, subsequent scribes did not add sectarian readings.⁷²

Christian tampering with the manuscripts of the LXX is evidenced only sporadically, and Kraft rightly claims: "Judging from available printed editions, the preserved Greek MSS and the versions derived from the Greek contain very few passages of unmistakably Christian intent—that is, 'Christian glosses or interpolations'."⁷³ Swete went one step further when saying that it is "improbable that the Greek O.T. was willfully interpolated by Christians, or that, if they attempted this, the existing text has been affected by it to any appreciable extent ... but apart from these, the Septuagint, during the first two centuries after Christ, suffered little from Christian hands beyond errors of transcription."⁷⁴ At the same time, there undoubtedly are Christian changes and interpolations in the manuscripts, but such changes are negligible. Rahlfs, Ziegler, Seeligmann, and Kraft provided examples of Christian corrections in some early LXX manuscripts, and Seeligmann and Kraft analyzed these examples at length, but the evidence is scant.⁷⁵

69 Thus G.J. Brooke, "E Pluribus Unum: Textual Variety and Definitive Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. T.H. Lim et al.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 107–119; idem, "Deuteronomy 5–6 in the Phylacteries from Qumran Cave 4," in Paul, *Emanuel*, 57–70; E. Ulrich, "The Absence of 'Sectarian Variants' in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran," in *The Bible as Book*, 179–195. On the other hand, two scholars believe that such sectarian readings are embedded in the text: A. van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches, Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (OBO 35; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 95–96; P. Pulikottil, *Transmission of Biblical Texts in Qumran: The Case of the Large Isaiah Scroll 1QIsa^a* (JSOTSup 34; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001). This discussion does not cover possible sectarian readings in the biblical text quoted in the *pesharim*, but these also are very rare. See my study "The Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert: An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts," in *The Bible as Book*, 128–154 (137).

70 *Scribal Practices*, 261–273.

71 Theological changes, possibly Pharisaic, have been exemplified in my *TCHB*, 254–256.

72 This view has been confirmed by S. Schorch (private communication, October 2008).

73 Kraft, "Christian Transmission," 207–226 (210).

74 Swete, *Introduction*, 479.

75 A. Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Acade-*

Different types of interference may be recognized, among them some variants that are mere apparent changes. A few examples follow.

3.2.1 Changes in LXX Manuscripts based on Quotations from the LXX in the NT (selection)

Ps 40 (LXX 39):7 **אָזְנִים בְּרִית לִי** (but you have given me an open ear [*NRSV*])—ὤτια δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι (but ears you fashioned for me [*NETS*]). ὤτια is the reading of Rahlfs, for which he quotes the minority evidence of La^{g76} and the Psalterium Gallicanum, while manuscripts B S A read σῶμα for which cf. Hebrews 10:5–6 where our verse is quoted as σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι (ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ εὐδόκησας) (*NRSV*: but a body you have prepared for me; [in burnt offerings and sin offerings you have taken no pleasure]). The reading in Hebrews thus found its way into the main manuscript tradition of the LXX.⁷⁷

In Ps 14 (LXX 13):3, all the LXX manuscripts (except for A and the Lucianic tradition) add a long section containing parts of the LXX text of Ps 5:10; 140 (LXX 139):4; 9:28; Isa 59:7–8; Ps 36 (LXX 35):2. The source for this addition is an anthology of LXX verses in Rom 3:13–18, among them Ps 14 (LXX 13):10, in which Paul refers to the sin of all humans.⁷⁸

3.2.2 Christian Changes (selection)⁷⁹

Ps 96 (LXX 95):10 “Say among the nations, “The Lord reigned!” According to Justin Martyr,⁸⁰ the Jews removed the words “from the wood” (that is, from

miae Litterarum Gottingensis editum (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), 30–32 (LXX Ps 13:2; 95:10; 50:9; 37:14; 49:6); J. Ziegler, *Isaias, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Gottingensis editum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), 100; I.L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* (Leiden: Brill, 1948; re-edited as *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies* [ed. R. Hanhart & H. Spiekermann; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004]), 24–30; Kraft, “Christian Transmission.”

76 Manuscript St.-Germain-des-Près of the *Vetus Latina*.

77 Alternatively, σῶμα was the original reading of the LXX, as suggested by H.W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989), 274. According to Attridge, the LXX reading is an “interpretive paraphrase” of MT, but that possibility is rather unlikely for this literal translation unit.

78 The Rahlfs edition presents this section in the text itself in parenthesis, but in my view it should have been relayed to the apparatus since Rahlfs himself dubbed this text a “Christian addition.”

79 Further examples are mentioned by Hengel, *Septuagint*, 31–33. In these cases, the Church Fathers accused their Jewish opponents of falsifying their Scriptures.

80 *Dialogue*, 73:1–2.

the cross)⁸¹ from the end of the verse. However, it is more likely that these words reflect an early Christian addition, now preserved only in the upper- and western Egyptian Greek manuscripts as well as in the Sahidic and Bohairic translations.

Isa 53:12. After this verse, the last one in the chapter, the margin of manuscript 86 and the Sahidic translation add the following remark “they pursued and persecuted <him>; they seized him and the Lord forgave them.” Isaiah 53 is a central proof text for Christianity, and therefore the addition in this chapter of Christian remarks is not unexpected.

3.2.3 Seemingly Christian Changes

Not all readings that look like Christian changes ought to be considered intentional, as some may have been created by coincidental mistakes or may reflect other textual factors. Kraft provided several examples of small alterations in manuscripts that can be viewed as Christian changes, but they are more likely transcription errors. His examples are subdivided into passages that include the term *χριστός*, references to the sufferings and crucifixion of Jesus, and the importing of NT passages into LXX manuscripts. For example, in Isa 45:1 MT “Thus says the Lord to his anointed one, Cyrus,” most manuscripts of the LXX read οὕτως λέγει κύριος τῷ χριστῷ μου Κύρω (to Cyrus), and it was natural that a reading Κυρίῳ (to the Lord) would develop.⁸² This was indeed the case in some Greek manuscripts known to Jerome.⁸³ Furthermore, Barnabas XII.11 uses this reading together with Ps 110 (LXX 109):1 (a literal translation of MT, εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου) as Messianic prooftexts.

The addition to the main LXX text of Ezek 16:4, ἐν ὕδατι οὐκ ἐλούσθης, of τοῦ χριστοῦ μου in codex A is not Christian, as surmised by Seeligmann,⁸⁴ but these words reflect a Hebrew variant למשיח for למשח of MT, not represented in the LXX, as mentioned by Ziegler.⁸⁵

Christian changes are found in all sources, and usually not in the main manuscripts. Obviously, the decision whether or not something reflects a Chris-

81 For details, see Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis*, 31. For an analysis, see Kraft, “Christian Transmission,” 216.

82 This is an unlikely reading in the context, as it appears after κύριος.

83 For details, see Ziegler, *Isaías*, 100.

84 Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 25.

85 J. Ziegler, *Ezechiel, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Göttingensis editum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 146. The reading of codex A, often Hexaplaric, runs parallel to the reading of Aquila and Theodotion εἰς σωτηρίαν.

tian change is a matter of interpretation. Liebmann and Seeligmann recognize such changes even in several readings that are found in *all* LXX manuscripts,⁸⁶ such as the addition τῷ ἀγαπητῷ σου to the text of MT in Isa 26:17 LXX. According to these scholars, this presumed Christian gloss replaced all earlier copies of the text. The same explanation was applied to the plus of the LXX in 27:4 τοίνυν διὰ τοῦτο ἐποίησε κύριος ὁ θεὸς πάντα ὅσα συνέταξε. Κατακέαυμαι (*sic*). Beyond the analysis of Liebmann, Seeligmann recognized Christian interpolations and changes in the combined evidence of all Greek manuscripts in additional verses (Isa 43:10; 53:4; 60:6). Thus in Isa 60:6, in the description of presents from Sheba, the words ἡ ἑκδοὶς κυρίου “and the glories of the Lord,” was rendered by the LXX as τὸ σωτήριον κυρίου, “the salvation of the Lord.” According to Seeligmann, this passage, mentioning the bringing of gold, frankincense, and myrrh, might easily remind an early Christian reader of the Magi, “who had come from the East to offer gold, and frankincense, and myrrh to the newborn Savior.”⁸⁷ This picture indeed occurs in Matt 2:11 without the word “salvation” and “savior,” but Seeligmann is quick to add that “in early Christian literature, Matth. 2.11 is repeatedly associated with Ps. 72.10 and Is. 60.6.” He also adds that τὸ σωτήριον is used in Luke 2:30 for the birth of Jesus. All these examples of possible Christian changes in the LXX are very unlikely, in my view, because by necessity they must have been inserted in the one copy from which all our manuscripts derived. In one case Seeligmann ascribes this copy to the second century CE.⁸⁸ By that time already too many copies of the LXX would have been circulating so that at least some unaltered readings would have been preserved for posterity.

4 Inspired Status of the LXX

Sacred Scripture is conceived of as having been written by God or by divinely inspired authors, while translations need not be divinely inspired. Whether or not the LXX translators were divinely inspired is not an issue to be analyzed in a scholarly discussion, and ultimately is a matter of belief.⁸⁹ A tradition of

86 E. Liebmann, “Der Text zu Jesaia 24–27,” *ZAW* 22 (1902): 1–56 (51–55); Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 26.

87 Seeligmann, *Isaiah*, 28.

88 *Ibid.*, 27.

89 The inspiration of the LXX is treated especially in French and Italian monographs; see Dogniez, *Bibliography*, 25, e.g. P. Benoit, “La Septante est-elle inspirée?,” in *Vom Wort des Lebens. Festschrift für Max Meinertz zur Vollendung des 70. Lebensjahres* (ed. N. Adler; Münster: Aschendorff’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1951), 41–49 (= *Exégèse et Théologie* [4 vols.;

divine inspiration for a translation would only develop if one believed it to be as authoritative as Scripture itself, or even more so. The story of the miraculous creation of the translation of the Seventy in Jewish sources⁹⁰ involves divine intervention, but not necessarily divine inspiration, as it would be hard to believe that Jews, knowing that the Greek translation differs from the Hebrew text, would give more credence to the Greek translation than to its Hebrew source. They believed that the source is more trustworthy than the translation, but nevertheless Alexandrian Jews had to resort to a translation because of their lack of knowledge of Hebrew. Only if these Jews were unaware of the differences between the Hebrew and Greek, the trustworthiness of the source would not be affected if one believed in the inspired status of the translation. Such an awareness is reflected in Philo's description of the translators. In *Vit. Mos.* 2.37, Philo describes the translators as "they, like men inspired (ἐνθουσιῶντες), prophesied, not one saying one thing and another another, but every one of them employed the self-same nouns and verbs, as if some unseen prompter had suggested all their language to them." Possibly also the author of the Epistle of Aristee considered the LXX to be Holy Scripture. Orlinsky⁹¹ suggested that the phrase used in § 308,⁹² "to read aloud," carries the intention of public acceptance of the LXX as Holy Writ, as this phrase is also used in MT with relation to the Book of the Covenant, the book found in the temple at the time of Josiah, and the reading of the Torah in the time of Nehemiah.⁹³

In Christianity, a concept of inspiration developed, since the new religion was based on the LXX to the exclusion of Hebrew Scripture.⁹⁴ Had such a view

Paris: Cerf, 1961]) 1. 3–12; idem, "L'inspiration des Septante d'après les Pères," in *L'homme devant Dieu. Mélanges offerts au père Henri de Lubac* (Theologie 56–58; Paris: Aubier, 1963), 1.169–187. Beyond the literature mentioned there and below, see A.M. Dubarle, "Note conjointe sur l'inspiration de la Septante," *RSPT* 49 (1965): 221–229; M. Harl in Harl–Dorival–Munnich, *Septante*, 294–295 (with bibliography); Kranz, "Vetera et Nova."

90 The story of the miraculous creation of the translation (thirty-six pairs of translators working in separate cells yet producing identical renderings in seventy-two days) is first represented in the Jewish-Hellenistic *Epistle of Aristee*, § 301–307 and expanded in later sources, especially Epiphanius, *On Weights and Measures* (fourth century CE).

91 H.M. Orlinsky, "The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators," *HUCA* 46 (1975): 89–114.

92 "When the work was completed, Demetrius collected together the Jewish population in the place where the translation had been made, and read it over to all, in the presence of the translators, who met with a great reception also from the people, because of the great benefits which they had conferred upon them."

93 Exod 24:3–7; 2 Kgs 23:1–3; Neh 8:1–6.

94 According to A. Wasserstein & D. Wasserstein, *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classi-*

not been nurtured, some Christians could have resorted to the Hebrew rather than Greek Scripture in cases of discrepancy between texts, undermining the authority of Christianity. Therefore, already at an early stage, the belief developed that the translation was divinely inspired and infallible and hence the way was open for several Church Fathers to claim that the LXX reflected the words of God more precisely than the Hebrew Bible.⁹⁵ They provided several arguments for this view, all at the level of belief, such as the translation being a *praeparatio evangelica*, the claim that the LXX fits the NT better than Hebrew Scripture, the belief that the LXX reflects the divine revelation better than Hebrew Scripture, and the view that the Holy Spirit guided the seventy translators.⁹⁶ Christianity held on to the sacred status of the LXX until that version was superseded by the Vulgate translation, several centuries after that translation was produced by Jerome around 400 CE. However, also afterwards, the LXX was held in high esteem within Christianity, and it is still considered the main source for the Old Testament within the Russian and Greek Orthodox churches, the former through its Old Slavonic translation.

The doctrine of inspiration was a necessity, since otherwise the NT would have had no authoritative source for its central ideas such as the virgin birth in Matt 1:23, based on the LXX of Isa 7:14. At the same time, within the church there was much confusion, as best formulated by Hengel:⁹⁷

Teachers of the church after Justin faced a number of open problems fundamentally beyond solution: the claim of the authority of the Seventy for the whole Christian Old Testament, whose contents still varied; the fact that the Greek collection of books itself contained portions of texts and whole books that do not appear in the Jewish canon and thus were not covered by the translation legend at all, while other works appear to be abbreviated in comparison to the Hebrew original; and, finally, the existence of competing Greek text traditions whose contradictions could only be masked, but not removed, by the charge of falsification.

Against this background, the preparation of the Hexapla by Origen was supposed to bring some clarity in a confused situation because it enabled the

cal Antiquity to Today (Cambridge: University Press, 2006), 68–69, “[t]he most powerful argument used by the Christian Church in favour of the inspiration of the Greek Bible is based on a story fashioned in the workshop of rabbinic *aggada*.” However, I believe that the doctrine of the divine inspiration originated within Christianity itself.

95 See Hengel, *Septuagint*, 26–50.

96 For a description, see Kranz, “*Vetera et Nova*.”

97 Hengel, *Septuagint*, 36.

internal comparison of the Greek versions as well as their comparison with the Hebrew text. At a later stage, Jerome brought about the decrease of the influence of the LXX by producing a new Bible version based on the Hebrew text, although he, too, constantly referred to the LXX.

The importance of the LXX to Christianity was so pervasive that in modern times Müller attempted to revive the centrality of that version for the western world, because it is closer to the text used by early Christians than Hebrew Scripture, which is the base for almost all modern translations.⁹⁸ He argued that the final form of MT was fixed *after* the beginning of Christianity, and should therefore not be used in a church environment, not even in modern translations.⁹⁹ This is a sensible solution, albeit highly impractical because the Greek text used by early Christians cannot be reconstructed. Besides, if Müller's view were activated, the church should opt for both the LXX (OG) version and its Jewish revisions since both were used by NT authors (above, § 3.1)

In conclusion, in this study we tried to unravel the complicated web of relations between the Jewish and Christian aspects of the LXX by focusing separately on its Jewish background, the roots of the NT in the Greek versions of Hebrew Scripture, the influence of these versions on the NT, the adoption of the LXX by Christianity, and possible Christian corrections in the LXX manuscripts. We left aside matters of canon.

98 Müller, *The First Bible*, 113–123 (“The Septuagint: An Alternative to *Biblia Hebraica*?”).

99 This view is also shared by B.S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 89: “Why should the Christian church be committed in any way to the authority of the Masoretic text when its development extended long after the inception of the church and was carried on within a rabbinic tradition?”

The Harmonizing Character of the Septuagint of Genesis 1–11

This study attempts to list and analyze the harmonizations of the textual witnesses in the first eleven chapters of Genesis.¹ Our two working hypotheses are: (1) Among the known textual sources of Genesis most instances of harmonization are found in the LXX. (2) Harmonization is the most frequent textual phenomenon in the textual witnesses of these eleven chapters (as opposed to omissions, additions, haplography, dittography, etc.). We should add that the listing of these instances and their interpretation is subjective regarding the very inclusion of the examples, the recognition of the translator's exegesis, and several additional parameters.² At the same time the recording is meant to be exhaustive.

In each case of harmonization we mention the presumed source(s) for the harmonization, nearby and remote. Instances of harmonization in the LXX are reconstructed from Greek into Hebrew. This study is limited to Genesis 1–11, since earlier studies of harmonization dealt with other Pentateuch units.³

1 Harmonizations in Genesis 1–11

1.1 LXX ≠ MT SP

1.1.1 Pluses of the LXX (45×, not counting recurrent pluses)

Gen 1:6 LXX ויהי כן (αὐτὸς ἐγένετο οὕτως) = vv. 9, 11, 15, 24⁴

Gen 1:7a LXX אלהים (ὁ θεός) = context and v. 4

Gen 1:8 LXX וירא אלהים כי טוב (αὐτὸς εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καλόν) = vv. 10, 12, 18, 21, 25

1 For an earlier attempt of such a listing, see Hendel, *Genesis 1–11*, 81–92.

2 Our recording disregards differences in minutiae such as prepositions and differences in verbal forms, vocalization, textually doubtful cases, inner-Greek doublets, and the Greek translator's exegesis, such as in etymological exegesis.

3 Tov, "Textual Harmonizations Deuteronomy" and chapter 12 in this volume.

4 Possibly this plus reflects the original reading, since the same reading in v. 7 MT (lacking in the LXX) is placed at the wrong place, after the implementation of the command in v. 6.

Gen 1:9b LXX ויקוו המים אשר מתחת השמים אל מקויהם ותראה היבשה (καὶ συνήχθη τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν, καὶ ὤφθη ἡ ξηρά) = v. 9a and possibly also 4QGen^k

Gen 1:11a LXX למינו (κατὰ γένος καὶ καθ' ὁμοιότητα)⁵ = v. 12

Gen 1:12 LXX פרי (ἀρπυμιον) = v. 11

Gen 1:12 LXX על הארץ (ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) = v. 11

Gen 1:20 LXX ויהי כן (καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως) = vv. 15, 24

Gen 1:28 LXX ובכל הארץ ובכל הבהמה (τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐρπετῶν) = v. 26

Gen 1:30 LXX רמש (ἐρπετῶν) = v. 26

Gen 2:4 LXX זה ספר (αὐτὴ ἡ βίβλος) = 5:1; MT: אלה

Gen 2:4 LXX אלהים (ὁ θεός) = 5:1; MT: יהוה

Gen 2:15 LXX אשר יצר (ὃν ἔπλασεν) = v. 8

Gen 2:24 LXX שניהם (οἱ δύο) = v. 25

Gen 3:1b LXX הנחש (ὁ ὄφις) = v. 1a

Gen 3:9b LXX אדם (τὸν Ἀδὰμ) = v. 9a

Gen 3:10 LXX מתהלך (περιπατοῦντος) = v. 8

Gen 4:22 LXX הוא היה (οὗτος ἦν) = v. 20

Gen 4:25 LXX חוה (Εὐαν) = v. 1

Gen 4:25 LXX ותהר (καὶ συλλαβοῦσα) = v. 1

Gen 5:27 LXX אשר חי (ἄς ἔζησεν) = v. 5

Gen 5:32 LXX שלשה בנים (τρεῖς υἱοὺς) = 6:10

Gen 6:15 LXX את התבה (τὴν κιβωτόν) = v. 14

Gen 6:19 LXX ומכל הבהמה ומכל הרמש (καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐρπετῶν) = 8:17

Gen 6:19 LXX שנים (δύο) = 7:9, 15

Gen 6:20 LXX הרמש על (τῶν ἐρπόντων ἐπὶ) = 1:26

Gen 6:20 LXX ונקבה אתך (μετὰ σοῦ, ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ) = v. 19

Gen 6:20 LXX שנים (δύο) = 7:9, 15

Gen 7:3 LXX ומהעוף אשר לא טהר שנים שנים (καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πετεινῶν τῶν μὴ καθαρών δύο δύο, ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ) = 7:2

Gen 7:17 LXX וארבעים לילה (καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας) = vv. 4, 12

Gen 7:20 LXX הגבהים (τὰ ὑψηλά) = v. 19

Gen 8:1 LXX וכל העוף וכל הרמש (καὶ πάντων τῶν πετεινῶν καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐρπετῶν) = v. 19

Gen 8:7 LXX למים הקלו לראת (τοῦ ἰδεῖν εἰ κεκόπαχεν τὸ ὕδωρ) = v. 8

5 Note the inner-LXX doublet duplicating two translation options found in the LXX of vv. 11, 12.

- Gen 8:12 LXX ויסך (πάλλιν) = v. 10
 Gen 8:13 LXX לחיי נח (ἐν τῇ ζωῇ τοῦ Νωε) = 7:11
 Gen 8:13 LXX אשר עשה (ἦν ἐποίησεν) = v. 6
 Gen 8:13 LXX המים מעל (τὸ ὕδωρ ἀπό) = v. 8
 Gen 8:14 LXX הבהמה (τὰ κτήνη) = v. 1
 Gen 8:21 LXX רק (ἐπιμελώς) = 6:5
 Gen 8:21 LXX בשר (σάρκα) = 6:19; 7:21
 Gen 9:1 LXX וכבשה (καὶ κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς) = 1:28
 Gen 9:11 LXX מים (τοῦ ὕδατος) = 6:17
 Gen 9:11 LXX את כל (πᾶσαν) = 6:17
 Gen 9:11 LXX אל נח (τῷ Νωε) = 9:8
 Gen 11:8 LXX ואח המגדל (καὶ τὸν πύργον) = 11:5

1.1.1.1 *Appendix: Other Pluses not Involving Harmonization (8×)*

- Gen 2:9 LXX עוד (ἔτι); MT SP >
 Gen 3:10, 11 LXX לו (αὐτῷ); MT SP >
 Gen 3:11, 17 LXX לבדו (τούτου μόνου); MT SP >
 Gen 3:24 LXX וישם (καὶ ἔταξεν); MT SP >
 Gen 4:10 LXX אלהים (ὁ θεός); MT SP >
 Gen 4:25 LXX לאמר (λέγουσα); MT SP >
 Gen 6:15 LXX את התבה (τὴν κιβωτόν); MT SP אתה
 Gen 6:16 LXX את התבה (τὴν κιβωτόν); MT SP >

1.1.1.2 *Interim Conclusion*

Almost all the numerous pluses of the LXX, against MT and SP, in these chapters, are harmonizing. This phenomenon occurs especially in the formulaic language of the creation story and in the two accounts of the flood story in chapters 6–8. This feature comes to light in a verse like 8:13 containing no less than three harmonizing pluses as listed in § 1.1.1 above. The feature of harmonizing is shared with the SP, against MT and the LXX, as recorded in different examples in § 1.4.1. However, in the examples recorded in the present paragraph most of the pluses are *not* found in the SP. At the same time, these chapters also contain a number of pluses that are not harmonizing.

The harmonizations are usually adapted to verses occurring earlier in the text, but sometimes to verses occurring later, for example in the parallel flood stories. In the mentioned verse 8:13, three harmonizing pluses and one change aim at earlier verses, while the pluses in 6:19, 20 aim at later verses in chapters 6, 7, 8, but also in the earlier chapter 1 (see the details in the list).

1.1.2 Differences (6×)

- Gen 3:17 LXX לבלתי אכל (μὴ φαγεῖν) = v. 11; MT לא תאכל
 Gen 4:18 LXX מתושלח (Μαθουσαλα) = 5:21–27; MT SP מתושאל
 Gen 8:4 בשבעה עשר יום (ἐβδόμη καὶ εἰκάδι) = v. 14; MT בשבעה עשר יום
 Gen 8:13 LXX כי (ἔτι) = 6:5; MT והנה
 Gen 9:7 LXX שרצו בארץ (καὶ πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν) = 1:28; MT שרצו בארץ
 Gen 9:16 LXX בניי (ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ) = vv. 15, 17; MT בין אלהים

1.1.2.1 Appendix: Other Differences, not Harmonizations (10×)

- Gen 1:9a LXX מקוה (συναγωγὴν); MT SP 4QGen^{h1} מקום
 Gen 2:2 LXX הששי (τῇ ἑκτῇ) = SP; MT השביעי
 Gen 3:6 LXX ויאכלו (καὶ ἔφαγον) = SP; MT ויאכל
 Gen 3:16 LXX תשובתך (ἡ ἀποστροφή σου); MT SP תשוקתך
 Gen 4:7 LXX תשובתך (ἡ ἀποστροφή σου); MT SP תשוקתך
 Gen 4:16 LXX ניד (Ναῖδ); SP נד; MT נוד
 Gen 4:26 LXX זה (οὗτος); MT SP אז
 Gen 6:3 LXX ידור (καταμεῖναι) = 4Q252 I 2; MT SP ידון
 Gen 7:20 LXX גבהו (ὑψώθη); MT SP וגברו; likewise v. 24 MT SP וגברו/LXX καὶ ὑψώθη
 Gen 8:21 בעבודת (or sim.: διὰ τὰ ἔργα); MT SP בעבור

Note further the major differences in the dates in the genealogical lists in chapters 5 and 11. These interrelated recensional differences were created at one of the compositional stages of the book, and they are not exponents of the textual transmission.⁶ These differences show that the dates in the lists were manipulated after the lists had been inserted in the book. In my terminology recensional or editorial differences reflect a systematic change in a text in a certain direction. It seems that MT is not recensional in chapter 11, but may be so in chapter 5. On the other hand, the *Vorlage* of the LXX and SP probably revised MT or a similar text in both chapters in a certain direction. I thus posit two recensions (SP, LXX), and one text (MT) in chapter 11, and possibly 3 recensions in chapter 5. These are the major changes in the lists:

1. Delaying of two central events (flood, Abram's lifetime) by postdating the date of the fathering of the individual patriarchs.

⁶ See chapter 15 in this volume.

2. Use of the exact same technique in the LXX in chapter 5 and the SP in chapter 11, of adding years to the fathering, especially with round numbers (100), while diminishing the date of the total number of years by the same amount, thus maintaining the same figures for the total life span of the patriarchs.
3. Combination of round and non-round numbers in the changed details.

1.1.3 Minuses (no harmonizations)

Gen 7:14 LXX >; MT *המה*; SP *הם* (1×)

1.2 MT SP ≠ LXX

1.2.1 Pluses of MT SP (11×)

Gen 1:7 MT SP *ויהי בן* = vv. 6, 9, 11, 15; LXX >

Gen 1:11b MT SP *למינו* = v. 12b; LXX >

Gen 1:27 MT SP *בצלמו* = 5:3; LXX >

Gen 1:29b MT SP *עץ* = v. 29b; LXX >

Gen 2:14 MT SP *שם* = v. 13; LXX >

Gen 2:15 MT SP *עדן* = v. 8; LXX >

Gen 3:6b MT SP *העץ* = v. 6a; LXX >

Gen 3:22 MT SP *גם* = v. 6; LXX >

Gen 4:26 MT SP *גם הוא* = v. 22; LXX >

Gen 8:17 MT SP *ושרצו בארץ* = 1:20, 9:7; LXX >

Gen 9:10 MT SP *חית הארץ* = v. 2; LXX >

1.2.1.1 Appendix: Other Pluses, not Harmonizations (1×)

Gen 7:14 MT SP *כל צפור כל בנה*; LXX >

1.3 SP ≠ MT LXX

1.3.1 Pluses (4×)

Gen 9:15 *אשר אתכם* = v. 12; MT LXX >

Gen 11:11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25 *מאות שנה \$ # ויהיו כל ימי* (in this summarizing formula, \$ stands for the name of the person and # for the number of years)
= 5:8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 27, 31; MT LXX >

Gen 11:31 *ואת מלכה* = v. 29; MT LXX >; the position of the plus in SP betrays its secondary nature: MT LXX “Sarai, his daughter-in-law, his son Abraham’s wife” has been changed in SP to “Sarai and Milkah, his daughters in law, Abraham’s wife.”

Gen 11:31 ונחור = v. 29; MT LXX > (the position of this word after אשת אברם betrays its secondary nature, recognizable, too, in the change of בנו to בניו)

1.3.2 Differences (5×)

Gen 1:24 SP וחית הארץ = v. 25; MT וחיתו ארץ⁷

Gen 3:16b בעצבון = v. 16a; MT בעצב

Gen 4:25 ויקרא = v. 26; MT וקרא

Gen 10:19 מנהר מצרים עד הנהר הגדול נהר פרת ועד הנהר האחרון = Gen 15:18, Deut 11:25
MT LXX מצידן באכה גררה עד עזה באכה סדמה ועמרה ואדמה וצבים עד לשע

Gen 11:14 ושלח חי = vv. 15–26; MT ושלח חי

1.4 SP LXX ≠ MT

1.4.1 Pluses (7×)

Gen 1:14 SP LXX להאיר על הארץ (εἰς φαῦσιν τῆς γῆς καὶ = v. 15; the wording of the LXX in v. 14 differs from the LXX of v. 15: ὥστε φαίνεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς); MT >

Gen 2:24 SP LXX שניהם (οἱ δύο) = v. 25; MT >

Gen 7:2 SP LXX שנים (δύο) = 7:9, 15; MT >

Gen 7:3 SP LXX הטהר (τὼν καθαρώων) = v. 2; MT >

Gen 10:32 SP LXX איי (νῆσοι) = v. 5; MT >

Gen 11:8 SP LXX ואת המגדל (καὶ τὸν πύργον) = v. 5; MT >

Gen 11:11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25 SP LXX וימת (καὶ ἀπέθανεν) = 5:8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 27, 31; MT >

1.4.1.1 Appendix: Other Pluses, not Harmonizations (1×)

Gen 4:8 LXX SP נלכה השדה (Διέλωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδῖον); MT >

1.4.2 Differences (3×)

Gen 2:23 LXX SP מאשה (ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς); MT מאיש

Gen 7:2, 2 LXX SP ונקבה (ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ) = vv. 3, 9; MT ואשתו איש

Gen 11:31 LXX SP ויצא אתם (καὶ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτούς); MT ויצאו אתם

⁷ SP removed the archaic form.

1.4.2.1 *Appendix: Other Differences, not Harmonizations (1×)*

Gen 2:2 LXX SP הששי (τῆ ἑκταῖ); MT השביעי

1.4.3 *Sequence (1×)*

Gen 2:4 והארץ השמים = v. 1; MT SP reversed

The summarizing table includes the major types of harmonizations and other differences between the three sources:

Summarizing table of harmonizations in Genesis 1–11

Relation	Pluses	Differences	Minuses	Sequence
1. LXX ≠ MT SP	45 (other cases, not harm.: 8)	6 (other cases, not harm.: 10 + major recensional diff.)	0 (other cases, not harm.: 1)	0 0
2. MT SP ≠ LXX	11	0	0	0
3. SP ≠ MT LXX	4	5	0	0
4. SP LXX ≠ MT	7 (other cases, not harm.: 1)	3 + major recensional differences	0	1

Summary of harmonizations: LXX 52, SP 22, MT 11.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the nature of the textual differences between the major textual sources in Genesis 1–11. This study is limited to the three complete witnesses MT, SP and LXX. T, V, and S are too close to MT to provide independent evidence, while very little relevant evidence has been preserved in the Qumran scrolls.⁸ While we did not list other exponents of textual transmission, it is clear that textual harmonization, especially pluses, is by far the most frequent textual phenomenon in these chapters in MT SP LXX. Formulated differently, while the main textual sources of Genesis 1–11 are in basic

8 See Ulrich, *BQS*, 1–8. There is limited evidence until 6:21, and none from there until chapter 17. Evidence would be relevant only if well-preserved texts could be subjected to statistical analysis. However, in those units in which the pre-Samaritan texts are well preserved they contain more harmonizing readings than the LXX. See chapter 27 in the present volume.

agreement in a rather stable textual transmission (the differences between the lists in chapters 5 and 11 are editorial), they differ in the matter of the harmonization.

Quite surprisingly, the LXX and not the SP includes the largest number of harmonizations in these chapters, especially pluses.⁹ Altogether, the LXX contains 52 instances of harmonization, followed by the SP with 22 and the MT with 11 instances. In 10 instances the LXX and the SP agree in matters of harmonization, indicating that they share a common tendency, often in the same details, but at the same time also differing much. The agreement between the LXX and SP is not strong enough for assuming a common textual tradition, but these two texts definitely share common inclinations. The exact same picture reveals itself in the text of Genesis 12–50 and Deuteronomy,¹⁰ and probably in all of the Pentateuch, but not all units have been studied thoroughly.¹¹

In my earlier studies I pointed out that the scribes adding these harmonizing pluses were very well acquainted with the context as well as with the parallel descriptions in other chapters.¹² For example, in Deuteronomy the scribe was well aware of the parallels between that book and the preceding books. We also noted that harmonizations occur in all sources with different frequencies. The same word or phrase may be added as a harmonizing plus in the Hebrew parent text of the LXX, SP or MT, or in the text common to two or three of these texts. This phenomenon shows that there is no overall guiding principle behind these harmonizing additions, and that they could be inserted at any given moment guided by the changing instincts of scribes. The greatest amount of harmonization was added in the parent text of the LXX.

9 This relation is well visible within a single unit, the first creation story in 1:1–2:4a. In this unit, which is already schematic, the LXX made the presentation more schematic in vv. 6, 9b (long stretch), 20, 30, while the MT and the SP did the same in vv. 7, 29. The secondary nature of some of these pluses is clearly visible. Thus in v. 7 יהי בן was added to the fulfillment of the commands in MT SP, not to the commands, as in the other instances. In v. 30 this formula has been added secondarily in all known texts in the same position, showing that it is impossible to reconstruct the logic of the original list.

10 See the studies quoted in n. 3.

11 For some initial remarks, see G. Dorival, *La Bible d'Alexandrie, 4: Les Nombres* (Paris: Cerf, 1994), 42–43; K.-R. Kim, *Studies*, 311 (the complete Torah); M. Rösel, “Die Septuaginta und der Kult: Interpretationen und Aktualisierungen im Buche Numeri,” in *La double transmission du texte biblique: Hommage à A. Schenker* (ed. Y. Goldman & C. Uehlinger; OBO 179; Fribourg/ Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires/ Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 25–40 (29–39).

12 See “Deuteronomy,” 282 and chapter 12 in the present volume.

When the harmonizations of chapters 1–11 are added to those of Genesis 12–50 we note that in absolute terms, Genesis (especially LXX-Genesis) contains more harmonizations than the other books of the Torah, but it should be remembered that the book is somewhat longer.¹³ The frequent occurrence of harmonizations in Genesis was also noticed, without examples, by Frankel.¹⁴ When including books beyond the Torah, my intuition tells me that LXX-Genesis contains the largest number of harmonizations in any one Scripture book. This supposition, based on a general impression of the textual evidence, cannot be proven in absolute terms.

The LXX stands out not only regarding its number of harmonizations, but also regarding their nature. The harmonizations in that source are more extensive than those in the SP and the MT. This is visible in Genesis 12–50, less so in chapters 1–11. Thus, most of the common harmonizations of the SP and MT consist of single words supplying a subject or object.

The harmonizations of the LXX need to be ascribed to its Hebrew source,¹⁵ not to the translator. Note the following differences at the inner-Greek level (between the Greek text in the harmonized segment and in the verse to which the *Vorlage* of the LXX has been adapted):

Gen 1:14 LXX SP להאיר על הארץ (εἰς φαῖσιν τῆς γῆς) = v. 15 (the wording of v. 14 LXX differs from the LXX of v. 15: ὥστε φαίνεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς); MT >
 Gen 1:30 LXX רמש (ἐρπετῶ) cf. v. 26 τῶν ἐρπετῶν
 Gen 6:19 LXX ומכל הבהמה ומכל הרמש (καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐρπετῶν) = 8:17 ἕως κτηνῶν, καὶ πᾶν ἐρπετόν

We reached the same conclusion with regard to the Hebrew background of the harmonizations of the LXX in Genesis 12–50 and Deuteronomy (see n. 3).

¹³ The five books in *BHS* contain respectively 85, 71, 50, 73, and 70 pages.

¹⁴ Frankel, *Vorstudien*, 79 gives the figure of 270–280 instances for Genesis, 100 for Exodus, 70–80 for Leviticus, 50–60 for Numbers, and 60–70 for Deuteronomy, without precise references. Our figures are relatively close to those of Frankel.

¹⁵ Thus also J. Cook, “The Exegesis of the Greek Genesis,” in *VI Congress of the IOSCS* (ed. C.E. Cox; SBLSCS 23; 1987), 91–125 (p. 119: “The translator of Genesis tried to stay as near as possible to his Hebrew *Vorlage*”). In an earlier publication, Cook ascribed the harmonizing features to the translator himself: “The Translator of the Greek Genesis,” in *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)* (ed. N. Fernández Marcos; TECC 34; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1985), 169–185. Aejmelaus, *Trail*, 91 does not accept Cook’s view.

TABLE 1 *Equivalents of יהוה in Genesis 12–50 (summary)*

יהוה	κύριος	87×
יהוה	θεός	14×
אדני יהוה	δεσπότης	1×
אדני יהוה	δεσπότης κύριος	1×

The appendix analyzes the question whether a very difficult feature in the LXX of Genesis needs to be ascribed to harmonization as well.

1.4.3.1 *Appendix: The Divine Names in the LXX of Genesis 1–11*

Various explanations have been offered for the unusual representation of the divine names in the first eleven chapters of Genesis, but none is completely convincing. (1) The preferred solution would be to link this issue with the overall harmonizing character of LXX-Genesis in its Greek shape or in the *Vorlage* of the LXX. At the same time, this feature could also be connected with the preliminary or free character of the LXX translation of Genesis.¹⁶ Other suggested explanations are (2) the LXX reflects a much differing Hebrew text, which could be relevant for the documentary hypothesis. (3) The translator intentionally deviated from a fixed translation vocabulary.

The usual equivalents of the two major divine names in all of the LXX are יהוה—κύριος and אלהים—θεός with relatively few exceptions. Such exceptions occur in all the LXX books, and they may be related to either the character of the translation unit or to a different Hebrew parent text. However, in Genesis 1–11 these deviations are exceedingly frequent, and some patterns are visible.

At the same time, the equivalents in chapters 12–50 are more fixed than those in the first 11 chapters, albeit not as fixed as those in the next books of the Torah and in Scripture in general. In these chapters the equivalence אלהים—θεός is stable, while that of יהוה—κύριος is less stable.

The unusual equivalence יהוה—θεός is rather frequent in these chapters compared with the remainder of the LXX. On the other hand, if the line between the two segments of Genesis is drawn after chapter 13, the second segment is more stable:

¹⁶ See chapter 33 in the present volume.

TABLE 2 *Equivalents of יהוה in Genesis 12–50 (by chapters)*

ch.	κύριος	θεός	δεσπότης ¹⁷	δεσπότης κύριος
12	6	1		
13	2	4		
14	—	1		
15	3	2	1	1
16	7	1		
17	1			
18	8	1		
19	7			
20	1			
21	1			
22	5			
24	19			
25	2			
26	7			
27	1			
28	2			
29	4			
30	1	1		
31	1	1		
32	1			
38	—	1		
39	8			
total	87	13		

On the other hand, the equivalents of אלהים are stable in Genesis 12–50:

אלהים—θεός	130×
אלהים—κύριος	3×
אלהים—no equivalent	1×

In the subsequent books of the LXX, the equivalence יהוה—κύριος is increasingly more stable, as illustrated by these examples:

17 Both δεσπότης and δεσπότης κύριος reflect אדני (יהוה).

TABLE 3 *Summary of the
equivalents of the divine
names in Genesis 1–11*

60×	אלהים	θεός
4×	אלהים	κύριος ὁ θεός
14×	יהוה אלהים	κύριος ὁ θεός
7×	יהוה אלהים	θεός
6× ¹⁸	יהוה	θεός
7×	יהוה	κύριος
16×	יהוה	κύριος ὁ θεός

Exodus

יהוה—κύριος	360×
יהוה—θεός	34×

Numbers

יהוה—κύριος	370×
יהוה—θεός	22× (especially in chapters 22–24)

2 Kings

יהוה—κύριος	270×
יהוה—θεός	0×

Jeremiah

יהוה—κύριος	460×
יהוה—θεός	8×

The equivalents in the first eleven chapters of Genesis thus need to be judged against the later chapters in that book and in the other books. The instability

18 Also beyond the first eleven chapters, the equivalent θεός continues (12×).

pertains particularly to the equivalents of יהוה, and in these first chapters there actually is no majority rendering of that word. Especially the frequent rendering of יהוה with ὑπερβασις ὁ θεός is very surprising, as shown by Table 3.

If the transmitted Greek texts reflect the OG translation,¹⁹ and if the OG was rendered from a Hebrew text more or less identical with the known Hebrew texts (see below), in chapters 1–11 the equivalence יהוה—ὑπερβασις was not yet established, while אלהים—θεός was stable. The *unusual* equivalents are now listed sequentially.

The unusual equivalents are best analyzed when reviewed separately for each of the divine names, first with regard to אלהים, sometimes preceded by יהוה.

When appearing alone, אלהים is rendered mainly by θεός (66×), but rarely also by ὑπερβασις ὁ θεός (4×). Further, in these chapters, the phrase יהוה אלהים is usually rendered by ὑπερβασις ὁ θεός (14×), but surprisingly also by θεός alone (7× in 2:4b–3:22). With regard to אלהים the major problem thus seems to be centered in the combination יהוה אלהים, for which no standard equivalent is visible. Thus, the alternation of the different equivalents in chapters 2 and 6 defies all explanations. The only clue seems to be the possibility that after a steady row of equivalents of אלהים—θεός in the first creation story, in 1:1–2:3 (35×), the translator continued using the same equivalent in 2:4–7, 9, 19–21 (7×), in disregard of the Hebrew text (יהוה אלהים). The idea behind such a harmonizing²⁰ rendering would be that the translator attempted to represent the deity throughout with the same equivalent. However, in such a scenario, the translator's plan was carried out very inconsistently: sometimes the translator rendered the two components of this phrase with ὑπερβασις ὁ θεός, while at other times continuing the equivalent of 1:1–2:3 (for details, see Tables 4 and 5). Such inconsistency is not unusual for the Septuagint.²¹

19 Most of the variants preserved in the Greek manuscripts, uncials and minuscules, are in the nature of adaptations to MT. For details, see the apparatus and Introduction to J.W. Wevers, *Genesis, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974). See further n. 28.

20 Hendel, *Genesis 1–11*, 35–39 likewise turns to the assumption of harmonization, but according to him this process took place in Hebrew manuscripts. He supports this assumption with five instances of an interchange of יהוה אלהים with אלהים in Qumran scrolls in Numbers, Deuteronomy and 1 Samuel. However, evidence from books other than Genesis may not be relevant; moreover, the assumption of different Hebrew readings has not been substantiated.

21 See chapter 3 in the present volume.

TABLE 4 *Unusual equivalents of divine names in Genesis 1–11*

Reference	MT	LXX
2:4b	יהוה אלהים	ὁ θεός
2:5	יהוה אלהים	ὁ θεός
2:7	יהוה אלהים	ὁ θεός
2:9	יהוה אלהים	ὁ θεός
2:19	יהוה אלהים	ὁ θεός
2:21	יהוה אלהים	ὁ θεός
3:22	יהוה אלהים	ὁ θεός
4:1	יהוה	ὁ θεός
4:4	יהוה	ὁ θεός
4:6	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
4:9	יהוה	ὁ θεός
4:15	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
4:15	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
4:16	יהוה	ὁ θεός
4:26	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
5:29	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
6:3	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
6:5	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
6:6	יהוה	ὁ θεός
6:7	יהוה	ὁ θεός
6:8	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
6:12	אלהים	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
6:22	אלהים	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
7:1	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
7:5	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
7:16b	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
8:15	אלהים	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
8:21 (2×)	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
9:12	אלהים	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
10:9a	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
11:9	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός

The representation of יהוה, equally inconsistent as that of אלהים, is represented as follows in Table 6 partly overlapping with Table 5.

TABLE 5 *Equivalents of אלהים in Genesis 1–11*

Reference	MT	LXX
1:1–2:3 (35×)	אלהים	θεός
2:4b–7 (3×)	יהוה אלהים	θεός
2:8	יהוה אלהים	αὐτοῦς ὁ θεός
2:9	יהוה אלהים	θεός
2:15–18 (3×)	יהוה אלהים	αὐτοῦς ὁ θεός
2:19–21 (2×)	יהוה אלהים	θεός
2:22–3:1a (2×)	יהוה אלהים	αὐτοῦς ὁ θεός
3:1b–5 (4×)	אלהים	θεός
3:8–21 (6×)	יהוה אלהים	αὐτοῦς ὁ θεός
3:22	יהוה אלהים	θεός
3:23	יהוה אלהים	αὐτοῦς ὁ θεός
4:25 (1×)	אלהים	θεός
5:1–24 (5×)	אלהים	θεός
6:2–4 (2×)	אלהים	θεός
6:9b–11 (2×)	אלהים	θεός
6:12	אלהים	αὐτοῦς ὁ θεός
6:13	אלהים	θεός
6:22	אלהים	αὐτοῦς ὁ θεός
7:9 (1×)	אלהים	θεός
7:16a (1×)	אלהים	θεός
8:1 (2×)	אלהים	θεός
8:15	אלהים	αὐτοῦς ὁ θεός
9:1–8 (3×)	אלהים	θεός
9:12	אלהים	αὐτοῦς ὁ θεός
9:16	בין אלהים	ἀνὰ μέσον ἑμῶν
9:17	אלהים	θεός
9:26	יהוה אלהים	αὐτοῦς ὁ θεός
9:27	אלהים	θεός

The equivalents of יהוה seem to defy all explanations, like in the case of אלהים. However, there seems to be a possible explanation for the renderings of יהוה אלהים in 2:4b–3:22 (7×) with θεός, since they continue the equivalent used in the first creation story, 1:1–2:3 (see Table 3). This harmonizing rendering, executed inconsistently, was analyzed above for אלהים.

TABLE 6 *Equivalents of יהוה in Genesis 1–11*

Reference	MT	LXX
2:4b–7 (3×)	יהוה אלהים	θεός
2:8	יהוה אלהים	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
2:9	יהוה אלהים	θεός
2:15–18 (3×)	יהוה אלהים	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
2:19–21 (2×)	יהוה אלהים	θεός
2:22–3:21 (8×)	יהוה אלהים	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
3:22	יהוה אלהים	θεός
3:23	יהוה אלהים	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
4:1	יהוה	θεός
4:3	יהוה	αὐτὸς
4:4	יהוה	θεός
4:6	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
4:9	יהוה	θεός
4:13	יהוה	αὐτὸς
4:15 (2×)	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
4:16	יהוה	θεός
4:26 (1×)	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
5:29 (1×)	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
6:3–5 (2×)	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
6:6–7 (2×)	יהוה	θεός
6:8 (1×)	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
7:1–16b (3×)	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
8:20	יהוה	θεός
8:21 (2×)	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
9:26	יהוה	αὐτὸς
10:9a	יהוה	αὐτὸς ὁ θεός
10:9b–11:9 (5×)	יהוה	αὐτὸς

By the same token, if the rendering of יהוה with θεός in 4:1–8:20 (7×) reflects a similar wish for the continuing the use of θεός of chapter 1, this tendency was carried out equally inconsistent as the translation of יהוה אלהים with θεός, since יהוה was also often rendered by αὐτὸς in 4:1–9:28. Particularly intriguing is the equivalent יהוה—αὐτὸς ὁ θεός in these chapters (14× in 4:1–10:9) used alongside יהוה—θεός (7×). In these chapters we thus witness two possible harmonizing tendencies alongside the rendering יהוה—αὐτὸς (8×). The equivalent יהוה—

κύριος ὁ θεός may display continuity with the text of 2:4–3:23 where the *main* phrase used is יהוה אלהים, usually rendered by κύριος ὁ θεός (7×). Secondly, the other equivalent used in these chapters, יהוה—θεός (7×), may hark back to Gen 1:1–2:4a where the equivalent אלהים—θεός (35×) is the only one used. Both developments would be inner-Greek, in defiance of the Hebrew.

The emerging harmonizing pattern in 2:4–3:22 thus is that the renderings of unit (1)

1:1–2:3 (35×)	אלהים	θεός
---------------	-------	------

are inconsistently followed by the LXX in unit (2):²²

2:4–3:22 (7×)	יהוה אלהים	θεός
---------------	------------	------

This harmonizing tendency is more clearly visible in the next units (3:23–11:9), where two different harmonizing renderings are used, again inconsistently, continuing the rendering of the first unit: יהוה—θεός and יהוה—κύριος ὁ θεός, with a few exceptions of יהוה—κύριος (8×), which later became the standard LXX rendering. These harmonizing tendencies involved pluses, minuses and changes, all executed by the translator. Of these eight “exceptions” to the translation pattern of יהוה, five occur at the end of this unit (10:9b–11:9), indicating that at that point a translation equivalent emerged that was to become the main LXX equivalent in the later chapters of Genesis and in the next books.²³

Two additional explanations of the unusual renderings of the divine names have been suggested:

²² In 2:4–3:22 the majority rendering is κύριος ὁ θεός (13×).

²³ Hendel's suggestion (see n. 20) is not worked out in detail. In his monumental study W.W. Graf von Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte*, Vols. I–II (ed. O. Eissfeldt; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1926–1929), I.453, n. 1 ascribes the double divine name κύριος ὁ θεός for אלהים to the translator's preference (“Liebhaberei”) or textual corruption, while he assigns the double divine name κύριος ὁ θεός for יהוה to a different *Vorlage*, יהוה אלהים, to be taken into consideration in the Documentary Hypothesis (I, 84–86).

1. The possibility that the translator *intentionally* deviated from a fixed translation vocabulary was suggested by Rösel, in great detail, for the whole book of Genesis.²⁴ According to Rösel, in every single instance of the unusual equivalent יהוה—θεός there is an exegetical-theological reason for the rendering of God's personal name with the more general θεός. Thus, according to Rösel, the translator deviated from the usual equivalent יהוה—αὐτός whenever יהוה is angry, punishes, or kills (as in 4:4, 9, 16; 6:6, 7; 12:17; 13:10; 16:5; 38:7, 10), when the text speaks about relations between non-Israelites and God (13:13; 30:27), and when God's power is shown (4:1; 15:7).²⁵ In all these instances the text mentions θεός. Rösel realized that not all occurrences of יהוה—θεός can be explained in this way (e.g., 8:20; 13:14; 15:6), and that these equivalences often are in defiance of the context. Thus 13:10 mentions the paradise of θεός (יהוה), while in 2:8, 15, 16; 3:1, 18, 23 and elsewhere, the text mentions the paradise of αὐτός ὁ θεός (יהוה אלהים) and of θεός (אלהים) in 3:3. A further difficulty is that in some instances different equivalents are used for these presumed features of God. Thus, in 3:13, 14, 23 αὐτός ὁ θεός (יהוה אלהים), in 4:15; 6:3 αὐτός ὁ θεός (יהוה) and in 18:20; 19:14, 24 αὐτός (יהוה) is angry and punishes, against Rösel's explanation.²⁶
2. It has often been suggested that the unusual equivalents of the LXX reflect a different Hebrew text, possibly shedding light on the Documentary Hypothesis. In particular in 2:4b–3:24 this suggestion is intriguing. This unit (source J) uses mainly יהוה אלהים, but also features אלהים in verses 3:1b–5 (5×). If the LXX would reflect a different Hebrew text, this chapter in the LXX would present a different grouping of יהוה אלהים and יהוה (see Table 6), respectively 13× and 12×. This picture would somewhat alter the evidence of the divine names, but in my view it is irrelevant to the Documentary Hypothesis.

24 M. Rösel, "Die Übersetzung der Gottesnamen in der Genesis-Septuaginta," in *Ernten was man sät: Festschrift für Klaus Koch zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* (ed. D.R. Daniels et al.; Neukirchen/Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), 357–377. This view was further developed in his study "Theo-Logie der griechischen Bibel: Zur Wiedergabe der Gottesaussagen im LXX-Pentateuch," *VT* 47 (1997): 49–62.

25 Rösel, "Gottesnamen," 370. However, not all these verses are relevant (4:4; 16:5), and besides, it is unclear why only θεός can be angry, why non-Israelites relate only to θεός, and why only θεός has power.

26 In another case, Rösel suggests that the unusual equivalent אלהים—αὐτός in 19:29 reflects a harmonization to the other verses in the Sodom pericope where the actions are performed by יהוה—αὐτός. See Rösel, "Übersetzung," 365. However, in the same verse אלהים is also rendered by θεός. Furthermore, the first αὐτός may also be based on a Hebrew variant יהוה. Likewise, Rösel suggests that אלהים—αὐτός in 21:2, 6 may well be a harmonization to יהוה—αὐτός in 21:1 in the beginning of the story.

The link between the divine names in Genesis, possibly bearing on the Documentary Hypothesis, has often been suggested in the beginning of the twentieth century,²⁷ but no firm suggestions have been made. One argument against the relevance of the LXX for the Documentary Hypothesis was presented by Dahse, who claimed that scores of inner-Greek variants uproot the validity of the evidence of the LXX for the documentary hypothesis.²⁸ However, most of these variants actually adapt the Old Greek to MT in manuscripts of the LXX revisions and therefore are irrelevant for the issue under investigation.²⁹ In my view, the LXX reflects inconsistent harmonization (see above). The most cogent argument against the assumption of the relevance of the LXX for any literary analysis is that no pattern is visible that would fit into any source-critical theory.³⁰ Furthermore, the choice of equivalents in the LXX is not determined by any context considerations.³¹ Besides, the documen-

27 H.M. Wiener, *Pentateuchal Studies* (London: Elliot Stock, 1912); idem, *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism* (London: Elliot Stock, 1913), 13–41; J. Skinner, *The Divine Names in Genesis* (London/New York/Toronto: Hodder Stoughton, 1914); H.M. Wiener, *The Pentateuchal Text: A Reply to Dr. Skinner* (London: Elliot Stock, 1914) [reprinted from *Bibliotheca Sacra* 1914, pp. 218–268]; J.B. Harford, *Since Wellhausen: A Brief Survey of Recent Pentateuchal Criticism* (London: Hunter & Longhurst, 1926) [reprinted from *Expositor*, 1925]; Hendel, *Genesis 1–11*, 35–39 likewise assumes that the LXX reflects Hebrew variants in the divine names, but he did not connect the evidence with the Documentary Hypothesis (see above, n. 20).

28 J. Dahse, *Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1912), 104–121; see also idem, “Textkritische Bedenken gegen den Ausgangspunkt der heutigen Pentateuchkritik,” *ARW* 6 (1903): 305–319.

29 Thus already J. Skinner, *The Divine Names in Genesis* (London/New York/Toronto: Hodder and Stoughton, 1914), 253–261 reacting to Dahse. See the data in Wevers, *Genesis*.

30 Table 4 shows that most of the unusual renderings are in the J section, as expected, since the rendering of אלהים (P) is rather stable. The breakdown of the renderings in Tables 5 and 6 does not add new information, since the rearrangement of the chapters to J and P according to the LXX makes little sense from the point of view of content. Thus if in the long J section 2:4b–4:24, the renderings of יהוה אלהים and יהוה with θεός would point to אלהים, reflecting the P source, these chapters would be composed of patches of J and P without any discernible logic.

31 For example, 4:26 יהוה לקרא בשם יהוה—οὗτος ἡλπισεν ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ. According to MT, God’s personal name יהוה was being used only from that point onwards, and it would have been appropriate had the LXX used κύριος. The use of the double name of God in the LXX does not seem to reflect any logic or a specific context in Genesis.

7:16 כאשר צוה אתו אלהים ויסגר יהוה בעדו—καθὰ ἐνετείλατο ὁ θεός τῷ Νωε. Καὶ ἔκλεισεν κύριος ὁ θεός ἔξωθεν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀβωτόν. The use of two different divine names in the

tary hypothesis depends only partially on the distinctive use of the divine names.³²

Summary

In this study I listed and analyzed the harmonizations of the textual witnesses in the first eleven chapters of Genesis. The listing of the evidence was meant to be exhaustive, but we are aware of its subjective nature. We formulated two working hypotheses: (1) Among the known textual sources in Genesis most instances of harmonization are found in the LXX. (2) Harmonization is the most frequent textual phenomenon in these eleven chapters (as opposed to omissions, additions, haplography, dittography, etc.) as well as in chapters 12–50. As a rule the textual witnesses do not differ in any major way from each other, but when they differ, they do so especially with regard to the phenomenon of harmonization.

In this analysis, I hope to have come closer to solving a major mystery, namely the representation of the divine names in Greek. The Greek renderings not seem to follow any logical pattern, but the most probable explanation is that from 2:4 onwards we recognize patterns of harmonization with the vocabulary of the first creation story.

If these suggestions are correct, the textual features discussed show that often within the Torah the LXX is far from being a good textual source. It shares its bad genes with the SP, as F.M. Cross would say. The evidence of the Greek Torah is in need of further analysis, to which I want to turn in future research.

LXX does not reflect any content considerations. Rather, the translator or his *Vorlage* harmonized the two parts of the sentence. The same θεός acted in both actions, but in the second one he is also named κύριος.

32 I am grateful to my colleague B. Schwartz for guidance in this matter. Two scholars decided against the relevance of the data in the LXX for source criticism: Skinner, *Divine Names* and M. Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie, La Genèse* (Paris: Cerf, 1986), 49–50.

Genesis 49 in the Septuagint: Trial and Error

The Septuagint translation of Genesis usually provides a literal representation¹ of its source text that was rather close to MT, and this pertains also to the large poetic unit in this book, Jacob's Blessing in chapter 49, probably rendered by the same translator who rendered the remainder of the book.²

The purpose of this brief study is to examine the procedures followed by the translator when encountering difficulties in the areas of lexicon, grammar, syntax, and content. This chapter forms a good area for such an investigation, since it is a closed unit and the text of the Song is often difficult in the mentioned areas.³ Accordingly, the present study does not focus on textual issues, but on translation technique. When experiencing lexical difficulties, the translator had several options, among them leaving words untranslated, turning to the context, providing provisional translations based on lexical exegesis and etymology, manipulating similar-looking Hebrew letters in the course of the translation, etc.⁴ The assumption that Genesis was probably the first unit to be

- 1 See Hendel, *Genesis 1–11*, 16–20; idem, “On the Text-Critical Value of Septuagint Genesis: A Reply to Rösel,” in *BIOSCS* 32 (1999): 31–34.
- 2 In the analysis of any translation unit the default explanation should be that the whole book was rendered by the same person, and only in exceptional instances should we assume different translators of segments of the book. Therefore whatever will be said about the rendering of chapter 49 pertains to the book as a whole.
- 3 The literature on this chapter is vast, including book-size studies, such as R. de Hoop, *Genesis 49 in its Literary and Historical Context* (Oudtestamentische Studiën 39; Leiden, Brill, 1998); C. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50* (BK, Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener Verlag), 198 = idem, *Genesis 37–50* (trans. J.J. Scullion, S.J.; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2002) provides much literature. Noteworthy textual studies are in chronological order: G.J. Spurrell, *Notes on the Text of the Book of Genesis* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1896); J. Emerton, “Some Difficult Words in Genesis 49,” in *Words and Meanings* (ed. P.R. Ackroyd and B. Lindars; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1968), 81–93; J. Barr, “ἐπίζω and ἐρείδω in the Septuagint: A Note Principally on Gen XLIX.6,” in *JSS* 19 (1974): 198–215; R. Macuch, “Hermeneutical Divergencies between the Samaritan and Jewish Versions of the Blessings on the Patriarchs (Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33)” in *New Samaritan Studies of the Société d'Études Samaritaines* (ed. A.D. Crown; London: Mandelbaum Publishing / The University of Sydney, 1995), 365–379; M. Rösel, “Die Interpretation von Genesis 49 in der Septuaginta,” *BN* 79 (1995): 54–70; M.A. Zipor, *The Septuagint Version of the Book of Genesis* (Heb.; Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2005).
- 4 See the analysis in my studies “Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their

translated is not axiomatic,⁵ but likely, and is definitely supported by the analysis below.

In examining the translator's approach in the case of problematical words, our working hypothesis is that many of the renderings were tentative and provisional, and involved many a translation option that was unusual, erroneous, and even illogical.

By its very nature this study is subjective. All renderings can be explained in different ways, and what appears to be logical to one scholar, is illogical to another one.

The following provides a subjective analysis of words that are objectively difficult. Some of these words were rendered in an acceptable way, while others were not. The recognition of what is difficult and acceptable is obviously open to different interpretations. Since our study is involved with translation technique, we disregard differences between MT and the LXX that are presumably due to different readings and exegesis. For example, the analysis does not refer to the unusual equivalents in v. 6 בַּקְהֶלֶם—*καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ στυγερᾷ αὐτῶν*, v. 10 שִׁילָה—*τὰ ἀποκαίμενα αὐτῶ*, and v. 24 אֲבֵן רָעָה—*ὁ κατισχύσας*. In the last two details the LXX probably reflects different reading as well as in the last word of v. 19 and the first word of v. 20.

1 Difficult Words Rendered in an Acceptable Way (10×)

49:4 פָּחוּז (*NJPS*:⁶ unstable)—*ἐξυβρίσας* (*NETS*: you became wanton)

This rendering probably reflects the same reading as SP (פָּחוּז), also presupposed by Aquila (ἐθάρμυσσας) and Symmachus (ὑπερζέσας). The LXX identified the rare Hebrew word well (elsewhere this root occurs only three times in Scripture).

49:4 אֶל־תֹּותֶר (*NJPS*: you shall excel no longer)—*μὴ ἀκζέσης* (*NETS*: do not boil over)

The simile of boiling over water, not found in MT, is contextually very appropriate after the mentioning in the beginning of this verse of פָּחוּז כַּמֵּים (*NJPS*: unstable as water)—see above.

Hebrew Text?" in *Greek-Hebrew Bible*, 203–218; "Bilateral Exegesis of Hebrew Roots in the Septuagint?" in *HB, GB, and Qumran*, 378–397.

⁵ See chapter 33 in this volume.

⁶ The following translations are quoted often: *NETS*, *NRSV* and *NJPS*.

49:4 אז חללת יצועי עלה (*NRSV*: then you defiled it—you went up onto my couch)
—τότε ἐμίανας τὴν στρωμνήν, οὗ ἀνέβης (*NETS*: then you defiled the couch where
you went up)

The translator appropriately represented the syntax of the Hebrew.

49:6 וברצנם עקרו שור (*NRSV*: and at their whim they hamstrung oxen)—καὶ
ἐν τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ αὐτῶν ἐνευροκόπησαν ταῦρον (*NETS*: and in their passion they
hamstrung a bull)

The translator identified the rare verb, occurring 7 times in Scripture, for the first time in the present chapter.

49:11 וּלְשָׂרָקָה בִּנְיָ אֲתָנוּ אֶסְרִי לִגְבוֹן עִירָה [ק' עִירוֹ] (*NRSV*: Binding his foal to the vine
and his donkey's colt to the choice vine)—δεσμεύων πρὸς ἄμπελον τὸν πῶλον
αὐτοῦ καὶ τῇ ἔλῳ τὸν πῶλον τῆς ὄνου αὐτοῦ (*NETS*: Binding his foal to a vine and
his donkey's foal to the tendril)

The translator correctly identified the unusual (ancient) case endings of אֶסְרִי
בִּנְיָ.

49:12 חִבְלֵי עֵינָיִם מִיַּיִן (*NJPS*: his eyes are darker than wine)—χαροποι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ
αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ οἴνου (*NETS*: his eyes are gladdening from wine)

The Greek equivalent of חִבְלֵי, possibly reflecting a verbal form חִבְלִי (= SP),
represented the content of this adjective well. The root occurs only here and in
Prov 23:29 (חכללות).

49:13 וְהוּא לְחוּף אֲנִיּוֹת (literally: and he shall be a shore for ships)—καὶ αὐτὸς παρ'
ὄρμου πλοίων (*NETS*: and he shall be near a haven of ships)

In view of חוֹף יָמִים in the parallel stich (as in Judg 5:17), appropriately trans-
lated by the compound adjective παράλιος (near the sea), the translator must
have pondered what חוֹף אֲנִיּוֹת (literally, a shore for ships) refers to. He provided
the contextual rendering “a haven of ships.”

49:13 וּרְכֹתוֹ עַל-צִידֹן (*NRSV*: and his border shall be at Sidon)—καὶ παρατενεῖ ἕως
Σιδῶνος (*NETS*: and he shall extend as far as Sidon)

The LXX provided a contextually appropriate rendering for רְכֹתוֹ, “his bor-
der/end.”

49:15 וְאֶת־הָאָרֶץ כִּי נְעִמָּה (*NRSV*: and that the land was pleasant)—καὶ τὴν γῆν ὅτι
πῖον (and the land—that it was fat [*NETS*: rich])

Avoiding a general equivalent for נְעִמָּה describing the land as “pleasant,” the

LXX depicted the land as “fat.” For the description of the earth as “fat,” cf. Gen 27:28; 1 Chr 4:40.⁷

49:26 וְלִקְדָּד נֹזֵר אֶחָיו (NJPS: on the brow of the elect of his brothers)—καὶ ἐπὶ κορυφῆς ὧν ἡγήσατο ἀδελφῶν (NETS: and on the crown of the brothers whom he led)

The LXX provides an elegant rendering of the meaning and syntax of the Hebrew. It must have been difficult for the translator to find an appropriate rendering of נֹזֵר that occurs here for the first time in Scripture. In most occurrences in Scripture נֹזֵר is used in the technical sense of a *nazir*, represented by different translations and also a transliteration Ναζιραῖος. However, in the present context, as well as in the identical phrase in Deut 33:16: נֹזֵר is used as “prince” (HALOT). In a similar vein, the LXX conceived of the word as “leader,” appropriately rendered with a subordinate clause.

2 Difficult Words Rendered by Problematical Equivalents (19×)

The renderings that are analyzed below were provisional and tentative, and involved many a translation option that was unusual, erroneous, and even illogical.

49:3 וְרֵאשִׁית אוֹנִי (NJPS: and the first fruit of my vigor)—καὶ ἀρχὴ τέκνων μου (NJPS: and beginning of my children)

At first sight, this rendering makes the impression of being based on the context, but probably the translator did not know this word. While אֹנִי occurs in Scripture in two main meanings, “strength” and “sorrow,” the former meaning has often not been recognized by the translators, rendered instead by “sorrow,” so that it is not impossible that also in our verse “my children” reflects a learned contextual guess.⁸ See, for example, the rendering of the Vulgate *principium doloris mei* (the beginning of my sorrow) preceded by similar translations in Aquila (καὶ κεφάλαιον λύπης μου) and Symmachus (ἀρχὴ δόλην). Likewise, in the LXX of Isa 40:29 אֹנִי is rendered by “sorrow” where “strength” is expected. Isa 40:26 δόξα probably represents another guess.

7 This analysis is preferable to the assumption of an underlying Hebrew variant שמנה which has two letters in common with MT נעמה.

8 Thus also Rösel, “Interpretation,” 57, according to whom this rendering reflects an adaptation to the context.

49:3 וַיִּתֵּר עָז (NRSV: and excelling in power)—καὶ σακληρός αὐθάδης (NETS: hard, self-centered)

αὐθάδης is a good equivalent for עָז but the asyndetic combination of the two adjectives is awkward. Most likely the translator did not know how to render the combination עָז וַיִּתֵּר, using the equivalent of עָז in the later verse 7 where it is appropriate in the context: אָרוּר אַפּוֹם בִּי עוֹ (NRSV: cursed be their anger, for it is fierce)—ἐπικατάρατος ὁ θυμὸς αὐτῶν, ὅτι αὐθάδης (NETS: cursed be their anger, for it is self-centered). For the second occurrence of וַיִּתֵּר the equivalent σακληρός is chosen, as for its first occurrence (יתר שאת). However, while for the first occurrence of עָז this equivalent, followed by a verb, is appropriate, it is not for the second one.

49:5 כְּלֵי חַמַּס מִבְּרִיתָהֶם (NRSV: their weapons are tools of lawlessness)—συνετέλεσαν ἀδικίαν ἐξ αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν (they brought injustice to an end by their choice)

For MT כְּלֵי (tools) the LXX reflects a variant reading (בְּלִי, they completed) also found in SP. Two of the three words in this stretch were problematic for the translator, מִבְּרִיתָהֶם and כְּלֵי/בְּלִי. In ancient manuscripts *yod* or *waw* were hardly distinguished, so that כְּלֵי (tools) and בְּלִי (they completed) would usually look very similar. As a result, the translator had to make a contextual choice between these two words which would lead to different sentence structures because of the different status of the two words (noun / verb). The lexical choice would also lead to different interpretations, since the two words would lead to diametrically opposed sentence structures. These problems are enhanced because of the difficulties inherent with מִבְּרִיתָהֶם, a *hapax legomenon* in the Bible, and usually understood as “their weapons.” Understandably, the translator was unable to identify this word, interpreting the first letter as the preposition -מ and not as part of a word, thereby causing a change in the syntax of the surrounding words. His rendering ἐξ αἰρέσεως αὐτῶν (NETS: by their choice) is probably based on the etymological understanding of the two root letters כר of מִבְּרִיתָהֶם as בר (“to choose,” as in בָּרַר), reflected also elsewhere in the LXX.⁹ This rendering clearly shows that the translator did not understand the context. For one thing, the message of the translation is diametrically opposed to that of MT: In MT “their weapons are tools of lawlessness” is specified in the next verses by the description of the nature of the violence. Further, in v. 7 “their anger” is “cursed.” On the other hand, the context in the LXX is positive. συνετέλεσαν ἀδικίαν can only be understood as “they brought the violence to an end.” These words imply that

9 See my study “Biliteral Exegesis.” On the other hand, Rösel, “Interpretation,” 59 ascribed this rendering to the root ברת.

no ἀδία was left, an idea that does not suit the description of the violence in the next verses in MT.¹⁰

49:6 כְּבֹדִי אֶל תִּהְיֶה בְּכַדָּם (NRSV: may I not be joined to their company)—μὴ ἐρείσαι τὰ ἑντὸς μου (may my inward parts not support [NETS: press in on] their company). Thus J.W. Wevers in the Göttingen edition,¹¹ although the majority of the manuscripts (A, B, D^G, F, M etc.) read: μὴ ἐρίσαι (may not contend, challenge).¹²

MT displays synonymous parallelism, rendered in NJPS as “Let not my person [נַפְשִׁי] be included in their council, let not my being [כְּבֹדִי] be counted in their assembly” and in NRSV as “May I never come into their council; may I not be joined to their company.” These translations are based on the understanding of the parallel pairs ס(ו)ד and קהל, of תבא and תחד, and נפשי and כְּבֹדִי. However, תַּחַד (a difficult form) probably became corrupted in the transmission of the text, since SP reads יחר (the masculine form suits כְּבוֹדִי), and the LXX must have read a similar word (in conjunction with כְּבֹדִי).

The resulting Greek translation deviates sharply from the implication of MT that makes a more coherent impression. The LXX probably reflects a reading תחר explained on the basis of forms like תתחרה (Jer 12:5 [not LXX]; 22:15) as “to

10 The attempt of NETS (they perpetrated) to bring the LXX in line with MT is problematical. The rendering of NETS is based on the fact that LSJ gives one reference for the meaning “perpetrate.” However, it would be more sound practice to explain συντελέω in accord with its base meaning, “to complete,” “exhaust,” as understood by the Old Latin *consummaverunt*. A good parallel for this understanding is Ezek 6:12 וכליתי חמתי בם (NJPS: I will spend my fury upon them)—καὶ συντελέσω τὴν ὀργήν μου ἐπ’ αὐτούς (NETS: I will spend my anger upon them), implying that at the end of God’s action no anger was left with him.

11 J.W. Wevers, *Genesis, Septuaginta* (Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum gottingensis editum, 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974). Barr, “Gen XLIX.6,” 201–203 discusses the possible meanings of the Greek verb as relating to תַּחַד, “be united.”

12 The LXX reading μὴ ἐρίσαι (mss A, B, D^G, F, M etc.) should be considered the main reading since it relates to a Hebrew variant to MT, namely that of SP, as discussed below (יחר), while no connection between μὴ ἐρείσαι (in the editions of Rahlfs and Wevers) and any Hebrew text can be detected. In the Hellenistic period ι, ε, and η were freely interchanged (“itacism”), and both verbal forms could have been written in the same way. We thus prefer μὴ ἐρίσαι (“do not contend,” “do not challenge”) derived from ἐρίζω, and related to יחר, to μὴ ἐρείσαι (“do not support”) derived from ἐρείδω. On itacisms, see especially P. Walters (Katz), *The Text of the Septuagint* (ed. D.W. Gooding; Cambridge: University Press, 1973), 29–69.

compete.”¹³ The assumption of such a variant is supported by SP יחר phrased as a masculine form due to its subject כבודי. Likely the MT vocalization כְּבֹדִי is more appropriate than כִּבְדִּי.¹⁴

49:9 מִטָּרְךָ בְּנִי עָלִיתָ (NJPS: on prey, my son, have you grown) —ἐκ βλαστοῦ, υἱέ μου, ἀνέβης (NETS: from a shoot, my son, you went up)

The picture of Judah is clear in the context of MT: Judah is a lion's whelp who stands up from his prey (טָרֶךָ) or has grown on prey (NJPS). The next metaphor remains in the same area: “He crouches, lies down like a lion” (NJPS). The metaphors are connected with the behavior of a lion in nature and the lion's feeding on prey. טָרֶךָ probably was not difficult for the translator; later on in the same chapter (49:27) he knew the root טָרַח well, as well as earlier in the book (37:33; 44:28). Nevertheless, in this verse the translator misunderstood the context when representing these three letters as טָרַח, “branch” (as in Gen 8:11 and Ezek 17:9).

Most likely, the translator was influenced by Aramaic, where טְרַפָּא is the regular word for “branch.” The resulting translation, “from a branch (NETS: “shoot”), my son, you went up,” is inappropriate. The majestic behavior of the lion, including the mentioning of the prey, is completely lost in the picture of the branch in the LXX. The picture of a lion standing up from a branch probably reflects a misunderstanding.

49:10 וְלוֹ יִקְהָת עַמִּים (NJPS: and the obedience of the peoples is his)—καὶ αὐτὸς προσδοκία ἐθνῶν (NETS: and he is the expectation of nations)

יִקְהָת, probably the construct state of a noun יְקָהָת occurring only here and in Prov 23:22, must have been difficult for the translator. Its original meaning was probably “obedience,” but in the translator's etymological understanding it was derived from the root קוה, “to hope,” “to expect,”¹⁵ taken as a verbal form. In the translator's mind, the singular verbal form יִקְהָת was governed by a plural noun עַמִּים.

49:14 יִשְׂשַׁכַּר חֲמֵר גֵּרָם (NJPS: Issachar is a strong-boned ass)—Ἰσσαχαρ τὸ καλὸν ἐπεθύμησεν (Issachar desired the beautiful thing)

13 Thus Barr, “Gen XLIX.6,” 207. Cf. a similar rendering in Sir 11:9.

14 The former is supported by Ps 16:9; 57:9; 108:2; the latter by Lam 2:11. The two words are equally appropriate in the context; thus also Barr, “Gen XLIX.6,” 198. The plural form ἡπατα, occurring only here in the LXX, attempts to adapt *kaved* to the context, taken here as “inward parts.”

15 Thus also the Vulgate (*expectatio*), Aquila (σύστημα), and the Peshitta (נִסְכּוֹן).

The depiction of Issachar in the first stich of MT as an ass suits the second one, even if the exact meaning of מִשְׁפָּחִים in that stich is unknown.¹⁶ The ass is described as “bony” (*gerem*).¹⁷ The participle רָבַץ (“crouching,” “resting”) in the second stich points to a laying animal, supporting the reading חֲמֹר (ass) of MT in the first stich. Instead, the LXX offers a different picture. It is unclear whether the Greek verse refers to a human or an animal described in the second stich as resting (equivalent of רָבַץ, “crouching,” “resting”) between the allotments (τῶν ἀλλήλων). However, the first Greek stich presents a completely different picture, based on the misreading of two similar Hebrew letters. The unusual translation may have been triggered by a misunderstanding of the rare word גָּרַם (“bony”) as another rare word, the verb גָּרַם, evidenced only in Ps 119:20 and Lam 3:16. It may also have been triggered by the reading of חֲמֹר as חָמֵד.¹⁸ With two slight interchanges (*daleth/resh* and *samekh/final mem*), the LXX created a completely different phrase חָמֵד גָּרַם (“he desired the good thing”)¹⁹ instead of מִט חֲמֹר. Interestingly enough, both word pairs contain a verb for “desiring.” In the new context of the LXX, Issachar “desired the good thing” instead of being a “bony ass,” providing a very general background picture. The Greek translation misses the animal simile, such as found elsewhere in this blessing, as well as the contextual link between the servility of the donkey and the ultimate destiny of this tribe as a toiling serf (end of v. 15: מַס עֶבֶד, see below).

49:15 ויהי למס עבד (NRSV: and became a slave at forced labor)—καὶ ἐγενήθη ἀνὴρ γεωργός (NETS: and he became a tiller of the ground)

In the description of Issachar, the translator did not translate מַס (“forced labor”), but filled in the slot with the general word ἀνὴρ (“man”).²⁰ The resulting translation presents the negative connotations of the Hebrew text (“slave at

16 The dual form *mishpetayim* probably expresses “divided sheepfolds” (*njps*). The transliteration of this word in Judg 5:16 ms A supports the assumption that the word was unknown to the translator. See my study “Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament: A Further Characteristic of the *kaige*-Th. Revision?” in idem, *Greek–Hebrew Bible*, 501–512. At the same time, in the previous verse in ms A, the same word is derived from שָׁפַח with a sin (ἐν μέσῳ χειλέων) probably reflecting etymological guessing. Judg 5:16 διχομμία in ms B (“double load”) probably also represents a guess translation. More to the point are the renderings in Gen 49:14 and Ps 68 (67):14 (both ἀλλήλος, “allotment”).

17 Cf. Prov 17:22; 25:15; Job 40:18.

18 For a parallel, see Num 16:15 where חֲמֹר is rendered by ἐπιθύμημα = חָמֵד.

19 Thus already Geiger, *Urschrift*, 360.

20 *Mas* is not a rare word in Scripture, but this is its first occurrence.

forced labor”) in a positive fashion (“tiller of the ground”).²¹ Aquila corrects to εἰς φόρον δουλεύων.²²

49:17 שפיִן עַל־אֶרֶץ (*NRSV*: a viper along the path)—ἐγκαθήμενος ἐπὶ τριβου (*NETS*: lying in ambush on the path)

The synonymous parallelism in this verse (שפיִן // נחש, and אֶרֶץ // דֶּרֶךְ) supports the assumption that שפיִן is a type of serpent, as unanimously interpreted (see *HALOT*). On the other hand, the *LXX* renders this *hapax* word as “lying in ambush,” possibly on the basis of an etymological interpretation of the two root letters שפ, also reflected in the Vulgate’s *insidiaberis* in Gen 3:15 for תִּשְׁפּוּנִי.²³ Alternatively, we may follow the interpretation of Spurrell, *Genesis*, 390: “The *LXX*, not understanding the word שפיִן, render it in harmony with the context.”

49:20 מֶלֶךְ יִתֵּן מִעֲדָנֵי מֶלֶךְ וְהוּא יִתֵּן מִעֲדָנֵי מֶלֶךְ (*NRSV*: and he shall provide royal delicacies)—καὶ αὐτὸς δώσει τρυφὰς ἄρχουσιν (and he shall give delight to rulers)

According to *MT* and the other versions, Asher produces “delicacies” that are “royal” (*NJPS*) because they are worthy of kings. In the *LXX* these dainties are *given to the kings*, probably because the translator did not understand the expression. The resulting translations are similar in meaning.

49:21a נִפְתָּלִי אֵילָה שְׁלָחָה (*NJPS*: Naphtali is a hind let loose)—Νεφθαλί στέλεχος ἀνειμένον (*NETS*: Nephthali is a stem let loose)

“Naphtali is a hind that was sent away” of *MT* fits the other blessings in which tribes are likened to animals (Judah, Dan, Joseph, Benjamin). Probably שְׁלָחָה misled the translator who did not realize that שָׁלַח can be used for animals as well (e.g. Job 39:5). The translator used a completely different simile, “Nephthali is a stem let loose,” based either on the letters of *MT* or another reading. If the *LXX* is based on אֵילָה (י) (“oak”), it is unusual that the translator did not use δρῦς, the frequent equivalent of that word (אֵילָה and אֵלֶּן).²⁴ The *LXX* provides a negative picture which is unwarranted here.

49:21b הַנֶּתֶן אֶמְרֵי שֹׁפָר הַנֶּתֶן אֶמְרֵי שֹׁפָר (*NJPS*: which yields lovely fawns)—ἐπιδοδὸς ἐν τῷ γενήματι κάλλος (*NETS*: bestowing beauty by the produce)

21 Geiger, *Urschrift*, 360 dwells on the translator’s intentions in this and similar instances.

22 Likewise, in the later *LXX* books the usual rendering of *mas* is φόρος (e.g. Judg 1:28, 30:35; 2Sam 20:24; 1Kgs 12:18).

23 For the technique, see my study “Bilateral Exegesis.”

24 For the use of a tree or branches together with the root שָׁלַח, see Jer 17:8; Ezek 17:6.

Neither MT nor the LXX version of these words is completely clear. The MT is usually taken as reflecting אָמַר, “word.” When continuing the explanation of the text within the animal realm, the blessing of Naphtali may also be taken as referring to lambs based on a vocalization אָמַר, “lamb.” On the other hand, the LXX presents a different picture within the realm of nature. The “stem” which at first was “let loose” in the LXX (v. 21a) now gives “beauty to/by/in the produce.” In the LXX the negative description of v. 21a thus developed into a positive description in v. 21b. It is evident that the LXX’s equivalent of κάλλος is שֹׁפָר, but it is unclear which Hebrew word the translator had in mind for the other words. The preposition ἐν (“in”) is problematical since it is unnatural in Greek and would also have been unnatural in Hebrew as ב. The best attempt at retroverting would be ב-פרי, graphically not remote from אֶמְרִי of MT, since ἐν would equal ב, and פרי (fruit) could have been rendered by γένημα (product). A variant on this theme would be the assumption of an underlying א-פרי, as in Aramaic, where the prosthetic *aleph* often represents the preposition עַל.

49:22 בֶּן פֶּרֶת יוֹסֵף בֶּן פֶּרֶת עַל-יַעֲוֶן (NJPS: a fruitful bough, a fruitful bough by a spring)—υἱὸς ἡτρεφόμενος Ἰωσήφ, υἱὸς ἡτρεφόμενος ζηλωτός (Ioseph is a growing [NETS: grown] son, an enviable growing [NETS: grown] son)

The LXX preserves the structure of MT, but carries a completely different meaning, although there are different options for its understanding.²⁵ MT probably depicts Joseph as a branch (בֶּן) of a “fruitful vine,” פֶּרֶת representing a participle of פָּרָה, like פֹּרִיָה (“fruitful tree”) in Isa 17:6 (thus HALOT). The LXX did not recognize any picture of a vine, providing, instead, an etymological rendering of the root פָּרָה. From Gen 1:22 onwards, this root is not rendered in the LXX as “to be fruitful” as suggested by Hebrew lexicographers, but as “to grow” as in the present verse.²⁶

The resulting translation of the LXX, “Ioseph is a growing son, a growing enviable son,” reminds us of the Joseph of Genesis and not of the tribes of Joseph.²⁷ In this context ζηλωτός (“enviable”) describing Joseph in the Greek translation of this verse, is intriguing. According to the sequence of the words, this word would be an equivalent of עַל-יַעֲוֶן (“by/on/near a spring”), but the

25 For a good discussion of the different possibilities, see J. Emerton, “Some Difficult Words in Genesis 49,” in *Words and Meanings* (ed. P.R. Ackroyd and B. Lindars; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1968), 81–93.

26 This equivalent is even used for פִּרְיוֹ in Judg 5:11 B. The meaning of this word is uncertain (HALOT), but it certainly did not derive from the root פָּרָה.

27 Likewise, in the description of Simeon and Levi in Genesis 49 elements in the biblical narrative are predominant, and not the nature of the tribe.

Greek is too far removed from the Hebrew of MT or any possible variant. ζήλωτος could allude to the story in Genesis 39, where Potiphar's wife found Joseph enviable. Alternatively this word refers to the envy of Joseph's brothers.

49:22 בנות צעדה עלי-שור (*NRSV*: his branches run over the wall)—υἱός μου νεώτατος· πρὸς με ἀνάστροφον (*NETS*: my youngest son; return to me)

This stich is probably the most remote from MT in the whole chapter and has no detectable logic. The Hebrew base text of the LXX is visible in some details, but not in others. Instead of בנות צעדה עלי-שור of MT, the translator read something like בני צע(י)ר עלי-שוב. Some of these letters are known to interchange elsewhere, but others not. Known interchanges are *yod/waw* and *daleth/resh*, while *resh/beth* are not known to be graphically close. Nevertheless, most likely the translator had the mentioned text in his mind. While the originality of צע(י)ר at the base of the LXX is remotely possible, the reconstructed stretch makes the impression of a very unlikely text.

It remains difficult to determine the meaning of MT and that of the LXX, but these issues are not necessarily related to the determining of the original text in this verse, which is even more difficult. בנות in the second stich of MT possibly reflects the same entity as בן in the first stich, namely a branch of the vine. The feminine plural noun בנות is probably the subject of the verb צעדה in the singular, as often elsewhere.²⁸ MT may then be rendered as “his branches run over the wall” (*NRSV*), even though this understanding is not entirely convincing. The impression given by the MT of vv. 22–25 is that at first Joseph lived in tranquility and prosperity (v. 22), but subsequently this quietude is disturbed by hostile forces (v. 23). Subsequently Joseph wins in the fight (v. 24), and he receives the blessings of God (v. 25). This forceful picture resembles that of Gad, who at first is attacked (v. 19a), but at the end overcomes his enemies (v. 19b).

On the other hand, the picture of the LXX, completely different from that of MT, is problematical:

1. Joseph is not the youngest son of Jacob.
2. Only in one additional verse in this chapter does Jacob turn directly to his sons, namely in v. 9, “from the prey, my son, you have gone up.”
3. It is unclear what the words “my youngest son; return to me” refer to. We may understand them as related to the biblical story, if Jacob turns to his son with the request that he return to him from Egypt.²⁹

28 See Gesenius–Kautzsch, *Grammar*, 464.

29 The same verb is used in natural contexts with regard to Joseph in 37:22 and 42:37.

In view of these difficulties likely the translator, experiencing difficulties in this problematical context, somehow tried to make sense of it.³⁰

49:23 וימררהו ורבו (*NJPS*: they bitterly assailed him)—εἰς ὃν διαβουλεύόμενοι ἐλοιδόρουσιν (*NETS*: one at whom, while deliberating, they would rail)

In MT the connection between the archers, בעלי חצים, and the attack on Joseph by archers (ורבו, “they shoot at him”) is natural. This connection is lost in the LXX where the verb ἐλοιδόρουσιν (“they scoffed at him”) is more general in nature. Undoubtedly the translator derived the Hebrew word from the root ריב, “to quarrel” (thus also SP ויריבהו, Vulgate *iurgati sunt*, Targum Onqelos, Pseudo-Jonathan, and the Fragment Targum). Since also the context in the LXX is hostile, that translation is not far off from the presumed original sense of the passage, but is nevertheless secondary.³¹ Strange and secondary is also the equivalent וימררהו—εἰς ὃν διαβουλεύόμενοι (“one at whom, while deliberating ...”). It is unclear why “they embittered him” (MT) is rendered by “while deliberating.” Seemingly this rendering makes little sense.

49:24 ותשב באיתן קשתו (*NRSV*: yet his bow remained taut)—συνετρίβη μετὰ κράτους τὰ τόξα αὐτῶν (*NETS*: and their bows were crushed with force)

According to MT, Joseph is victorious in the battle with his enemies, the archers, as expressed by the phrase “his <Joseph’s> bow remained strong.” However, the LXX applies the description to the bows of Joseph’s enemies.³² The difference between MT and the translator’s Hebrew text is only a single Hebrew letter, since ותשב of MT was undoubtedly read as ותשבר (“and was broken”), συνετρίβω being the standard equivalent of שבר, “to break.” It is unclear whether the translator actually found such a reading in front of him; rather, he had difficulty in understanding the phrase ותשב באיתן קשתו which has no equal elsewhere in Scripture. He may have manipulated his Hebrew text, while changing the number and suffix of the “bow” from “his bow” (Joseph’s bow) to “their bows” (the bows of the enemies).

49:24 ויפזו זרעי ידיו (literally: and the arms of his hands were quick-moving)—καὶ ἐξελύθη τὰ νεύρα βραχιόνων χειρῶν αὐτῶν (and the sinews of the arms of their hands were loosened [*NETS*: gave way])

30 Cf. Spurrell, *Genesis*, 395: “The verse appears to have been entirely misunderstood by the Vss.” J. Skinner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1930), 530: “defies explanation.”

31 Thus also Spurrell, *Genesis*, 395.

32 Cf. Jer 49:35 (LXX: 25:14) for the picture and equivalents and 1 Sam 2:4 for the picture.

As in the preceding picture in this verse quoted above, MT and LXX have a different perception of the subject of the action. In MT the agility of the arms of Joseph brings the victory, while the LXX speaks of the arms of the enemies. Once again the translator adapted the pronoun to his interpretation of the first stich, but in this case more intrusive changes were called for, as he also had to change the positive meaning of ויפזו (“were quick-moving”) to a negative sense. Thus “were quick-moving” became “were loosened” in the translation, because the action now refers to the bows of the enemies.³³

זרעי ידי of MT (literally: the arms of his hands), presenting an unusual combination in the Bible, should probably be understood as a *hendiadys* referring to one concept, arms. The translator added the picture of the sinews (τὰ νεῦρα), because they and not the arms were loosened.³⁴

49:25 ברכת תהום רבצת תחת (NRSV: blessings of the deep that lies beneath)—καὶ εὐλογίαν γῆς ἐχούσης πάντα· ἔνεκεν ... (NETS: and a blessing of earth containing everything, because of ...)

Seemingly MT is not difficult, but the translator nevertheless misunderstood the *adverbial* use of תחת (beneath). He took this word as a preposition, and gave it the wrong meaning (ἔνεκεν, “because of”) not evidenced elsewhere. With the new understanding, ἔνεκεν starts a new sentence that continues in the next verse: ἔνεκεν εὐλογίας μαστῶν καὶ μήτρας, εὐλογίας πατρός σου καὶ μητρός σου· ὑπερίσχυσεν, “because of the blessing of breasts and of womb, a blessing of your father and of your mother; it has prevailed” (NETS). The major problem pertains to the connection between the components of the verse.

49:27 בבקר יאכל עד (NRSV: in the morning devouring the prey)—τὸ πρωινὸν ἔδεσται ἔτι (NETS: in the early morning he shall still be devouring)

Not recognizing עד (prey), occurring rarely in the Bible,³⁵ the translator misunderstood the context. The translator opted for the more frequent vocaliza-

33 A similar exegetical tradition is reflected in *v dissoluta sunt* (“were dissolved”) and אתכדירו (“became weak”). In these two versions the action refers to Joseph whose force wanes because of God as expressed by the next words in the verse.

34 In the terminology of the HUBP, this procedure is named a “slot,” that is, when a translator realizes that he represents two Hebrew words with one (here, “the arms of the hands” rendered as “arms”), he sometimes feels the need to add a supplement of some kind. See Goshen-Gottstein, *Sample Edition*, 31. BHS retroverted the LXX into Hebrew (גידי זרעיו), but the translator probably never knew such a reading.

35 The only certain occurrence of this word is in Isa 33:23.

tion טַי (still), thereby completely altering the sense of the verse.³⁶ The logic of the Hebrew is that the wolf catches and devours his prey in the morning, and that there is enough left in the evening to be divided. On the other hand, in the LXX there is no equivalent for the word “prey” in the morning, so that the wolf actually has nothing to divide in the evening. Furthermore, in the LXX the word “still,” referring to an earlier situation not mentioned in the text, is not understandable. Also, since the translator missed the word “prey” in the first stich, he decided not to render the parallel לַלַּיִל as prey, but as the general “food” (τροφῆ).

In sum, everywhere in the Hebrew Bible appear words that are problematical for the translators, but within Genesis they occur in a concentrated way in chapter 49, an ancient song containing several unusual poetical words and forms that would have been difficult for any translator, definitely at this early stage in the Bible translation enterprise. The same pertains to the Song of Moses in Exodus 15 in comparison with the other chapters in Exodus. The purpose of this brief study was to examine the procedures followed by the translator when encountering difficulties in the areas of lexicon, grammar, syntax, and content. While several difficulties were solved satisfactorily (10×), in most cases we can see the translator struggling with the unusual and poetical words and forms (19×). When experiencing lexical differences, the translator had several options, among them, leaving words untranslated, turning to the context, providing provisional translations based on lexical exegesis and etymology, manipulating similar Hebrew letters in the course of the translation, etc. The translator of this chapter resorted to all these options. As a result of these provisional translation options, the translation is not infrequently illogical and not understandable.

36 Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition*, 47–54 mentions many vocalization variations between MT and the versions relating to these two letters.

The Septuagint Translation of Genesis as the First Scripture Translation

Although many important studies have been written about the LXX translation in general as well as its individual books, we possess no firm knowledge about the circumstances surrounding these translations.¹ In short, we do not know much about the translators and their enterprise,² nor even the sequence in which the books were translated. We subscribe to the *communis opinio* that the Torah was translated first,³ but even with that view in mind, we do not know whether the five⁴ translators of the Pentateuch translated these books at the same time, one after the other, or without a fixed sequence.⁵ The only information on the authorship of the translations and their presumed sequence comes from the internal analysis of the translation units, their style, vocabulary, translation technique, and peculiarities. Naturally, this type of investigation does not warrant firm conclusions.

-
- 1 A modest beginning was made in my paper “Reflections on the Septuagint with Special Attention Paid to the Post-Pentateuchal Translations,” see chapter 29 in the present volume. That study, referring also to earlier investigations, focuses on the circumstances surrounding the creation of the post-Pentateuchal translations.
 - 2 According to N.L. Collins, *The Library in Alexandria and the Bible in Greek* (VTSup 82; Leiden, 2000), 51, 141, basing herself on the Epistle of Aristeas § 307 (“72 days”), the translation of the Torah was created by 71 sages in 90 days (taking into consideration days of rest), while according to Th. van der Louw, “The Duration of the LXX-Pentateuch Project,” *BIOCS* 43 (2010): 41–51 (42), the translation of Genesis was created in 5 months. However, both estimates are based on the traditional description, and not on real evidence.
 - 3 On the other hand, J. Barr expressed the opinion that the translation of Isaiah preceded that of the Torah because of the lack of a consistent translation approach by the Greek translator of Isaiah: “Did the Greek Pentateuch Really Serve as a Dictionary for the Translation of the Later Books?,” in Muraoka, *Hamlet*, 523–543 (539).
 - 4 Thus Hayeon Kim, *Multiple Authorship of the Septuagint Pentateuch*, Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 2007.
 - 5 For example, according to den Hertog, the translators of Leviticus and Numbers used an existing translation of Deuteronomy: C.G. den Hertog, “Erwägungen zur relativen Chronologie der Bücher Levitikus und Deuteronomium innerhalb der Pentateuchübersetzung,” in *Brennpunkt* 2, 216–228.

With these questions in mind we turn to the LXX translation of Genesis.⁶ Assuming that Genesis was the first book to be translated (see n. 3), that translation enterprise would have created major problems for the first translator(s), who would have struggled with such issues as the choice of a translation style (literal or free; fixed equivalents or not), the meaning of Hebrew words, the inclusion of exegetical elements, and much more. It would seem an almost impossible job for the very first translator to work out these difficult decisions while on the job, and to produce a responsible translation. In our days we would say that such a translator bears a scholarly responsibility, and he would be accountable to the public and open to criticism. However, we do not know how accountable the translators were in antiquity. The translation of the Torah was used in the public reading,⁷ long after the time of the translation, but we do not know whether it was scrutinized when it was first used.

It often seems as if the translator of Genesis has worked out many of the problems relating to the choice of translation vocabulary and the conversion of categories in Hebrew/Aramaic grammar to Greek.⁸ The translation makes

6 We regard this translation as having been produced by a single translator, one of the five translators that produced the LXX translation of the Pentateuch. See Kim, *Multiple Authorship*. However, for the purpose of this study it does not make much difference whether the translator(s) of Genesis rendered only this book or all five books of the Pentateuch. Nor does it make much difference whether the first part of the book was rendered by a translator A and the second part by a translator B. Such a theory had been suggested in a very brief study by O.J. Baab, "A Theory of Two Translators for the Greek Genesis," *JBL* 52 (1933): 239–243. It should be noted that the arguments given by Baab are not convincing as they cover mainly a few particles and prepositions, and the data themselves are often incorrect. On this issue, see further A. Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis in the Septuagint: A Study of the Renderings of the Hebrew Coordinate Clauses in the Greek Pentateuch* (AASF, Diss. Hum. Litt. 31; Helsinki, 1982), 59–60 and 159–181.

7 Philo, *Prob.* 81–82 refers to this custom in Alexandria: "In these they are instructed at all other times, but particularly on the seventh days. For that day has been set apart to be kept holy and on it they abstain from all other work and proceed to sacred spots which they call synagogues ... Then one takes the books and reads aloud ..." See further Philo, *Hypoth.* 7:13; *Moses* 2:215. Furthermore, 4 Macc 18:10–18, possibly written in Egypt in the first century CE, expressly mentions the reading of the Law accompanied by readings taken from the Prophets, Psalms, and Hagiographa.

8 Good examples from the first chapter are: the presentation of the *waw* with δέ in v. 2a (see, however, below, section A, item 9); the presentation of אלהים with ὁ θεός, including the article; the translation of the inverted verbal forms like ויאמר with ἀπελπεῖν in v. 3; the representation of the jussive form יקוו with the imperative στυγέτω in v. 9; the translation of אשר with οὖν in v. 12; the representation of the *lamed* of the infinitive with τοῦ in v. 14 and with ὡς in v. 15; the rendering of הנה with ὅτι in v. 29; the well-considered translation of לאמר with

such a finalized impression that it has often been suggested that the known Greek translation does not represent the very first translation of this book, but was preceded by earlier, experimental renderings of Genesis or of the Torah as a whole. This may have indeed been the case, but, this assumption cannot be proven, supported only by a misleading reference in the Epistle of Aristee.⁹ However, when studying the status of the Greek translation of Genesis, we notice that the translation is not so finalized as it seems at first blush, and that it shows signs of the translator's hesitations. The later translators would look up to the translation vocabulary of the Torah, which they often followed and used as a source for lexical information,¹⁰ but the translator of Genesis himself was still hesitant. He produced a final product, and it was not experimental, but in retrospect the translation was not yet as mature as the later ones. Among these later translation units we find both literal translations, such as the *kaige*-Th translation of major segments in Samuel-Kings and the very free translation of Isaiah. On the other hand, Genesis displays a curious mixture of translation styles, often adhering to fixed equivalents, but also allowing for contextual renderings. Furthermore, one often notices the hesitations of the translator, his use of different translation equivalents, and his trying out different possibilities in transferring grammatical categories from a Semitic to an Indo-European language.

We suggest that the translation of Genesis shows signs of its being the first translation, but these signs can only be discovered through a careful analysis of vocabulary and translation technique. We often observe the first translator at work in his language laboratory, which to a certain extent is true for most translators. We see how the translator hesitates, changes his mind, and errs. At the same time, the translator had to make decisions on translation equivalents to be used.¹¹ To the best of our knowledge, as the translation continued, the

λέγων in v. 22, followed by all subsequent translators; the Hebraistic rendering of יסף in the *hiph'il* with προστίθημι from Gen 4:2 onwards, etc. Likewise, the system for rendering the various usages of לפני is already well developed in Genesis, see R. Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (AASF, Diss. Hum. Litt. 19; Helsinki, 1979), 68–80.

9 §30: "The books of the law of the Jews (with some few others) are absent from the library. They are written in the Hebrew characters and language and have been carelessly σεσήμανται ..." If σεσήμανται is taken "interpreted" or "translated," the Epistle may refer to earlier translations. However, most scholars believe that this word means "copied" or "written" and refers to Hebrew Scripture. For a discussion, see Jellicoe, *SMS*, 51–52.

10 See my study "The Impact of the LXX Translation of the Pentateuch on the Translation of the Other Books," in *Greek-Hebrew Bible*, 183–194.

11 The following examples illustrate this process. The first equivalent of the verb בָּרַךְ in

translator did not go back to the earlier renderings,¹² correcting earlier understandings, or standardizing his vocabulary.¹³

In this study we provide *non-exhaustive* examples of the presumed procedures, culled from an in-depth reading of several chapters in the beginning of the book. The overriding principle behind our study is that the translator, while generally adhering to a system of fixed equivalents, was often uncertain in matters of vocabulary and translation technique. In other words, the translation vocabulary was being established as the translator proceeded with his translation. In each case, the different translation options did not result from the translator's wish for variation in the translation.

In section 2 we show how the renderings of Genesis were not followed in the next translation units. Many translation options of Genesis, and of the Pentateuch as a whole, were followed in the post-Pentateuchal books (see n. 10), but this is not the case in the examples in section 2. These examples show the independent status of the translation units, but additional study is in order.

Genesis, in 1:22, εὐλογέω, has remained a steady equivalent throughout the LXX, by far the major one. This equivalent is not the most natural one, as the Hebrew verb means "to bless (God or men)," and the Greek "to speak well," "to praise." As there exist other Greek words for "to bless" (εὐτυχέω, μακαρίζω), this equivalent is not obvious. See J. Joosten, "Le vocabulaire de la Septante et la question du sociolecte des juifs alexandrins. Le cas du verbe εὐλογέω, 'bénir,'" in *Septuagint Vocabulary. Pre-history, Usage, Reception* (ed. E. Bons & J. Joosten; SBLSCS 58; Atlanta, 2011), 17. It remains an open question why εὐλογέω has been chosen for this purpose. Joosten, *ibid.* suggests that this equivalent had been chosen in the prayer language of the Alexandrian Jews in the period before the LXX translation. Likewise, from Gen 19:27 onwards, בבקר, "in the morning," is rendered by the adverb τὸ πρωί, "in the morning," but the Greek phrase is also used as a noun from Gen 1:5, 8 onwards. This use is unique within the Greek language, see T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Louvain/Paris/Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2009), 604.

12 For example, מִטָּה *mittah* "bed," a not uncommon word in Scripture (occurring 29 times), was not recognized at its first occurrence by the translator of Genesis, who rendered it in 47:31 as *matteh* (staff, tribe), occurring much more frequently in Scripture (205×). The translator of Genesis was used to *matteh*, occurring in the earlier verses Gen 38:18, 25. Rather naively, he thus created a very unusual context in 47:31: "Then Israel bowed at the head of the bed (MT as translated in *NJPS*)"—"and Israel did obeisance at the top of his staff (LXX as translated in *NETS*)." Two verses later (48:2) as well as in 49:33 the translator correctly identified this word as "bed" (κλίνη), but he did not correct the earlier rendering of this word. See J. Barr, "Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew among the Ancient Translators," *VTSup* 16 (1967), 1–11 (3).

13 Technically, such a correction procedure would have been difficult: the insertion of changes in scrolls of papyrus or parchment would have been prohibitive, if not impossible. Furthermore, without concordances, the translator would not have been able to locate earlier renderings of the same word or construction. See Tov, "Early Scrolls."

1 The Septuagint of Genesis Uses an Equivalent in the First Chapters Differing from Equivalents Used Later in the Book

In the following examples usually a difference can be found between translation options in the first ten chapters and the subsequent chapters.

1. The first occurrence of הכה is rendered by ἀναιρέω (4:13). Only later, in 8:21, the translator presents the equivalent that would become its main translation in the LXX, viz., πατάσσω (333×). The latter equivalent occurs altogether 5× in Genesis, but that book also contains three additional equivalents: κατακόπτω (2×), ἐκκόπτω (2×), and συγκατόπτω (1×). The translator thus did not start off with the Greek verb that would become the main equivalent in the LXX, πατάσσω. As it happens, ἀναιρέω (“to kill”) is a better equivalent of הכה (literally: “to smite”; usually: “to kill”) than πατάσσω (“to strike”).¹⁴
2. The first occurrence of יָלֵד (Gen 4:23) is rendered by γεννίσκος. This equivalent is not used elsewhere in Genesis nor in most books of the LXX, but it recurs in chapter 1 of the LXX-Daniel (4×). In Genesis itself, the translator uses other equivalents after 4:23: παιδίον (13×), παιδάριον (3×), υἱός (1×), τέκνον (2×). Among other things, in 33:1–14 the translator uses four different equivalents referring to the same children. After 4:23, the translator of Genesis thus abandoned the equivalent γεννίσκος for יָלֵד, applying the Greek word five times to נָעַר and not to additional Hebrew words. Elsewhere in the LXX, παιδίον and παιδάριον became the most frequent equivalents of this Hebrew word. This example shows how the translator used an equivalent once, subsequently abandoning this equivalent and applying it to another Hebrew word.
3. The first equivalent of בהמה in the LXX is τετράποδος (1:24), literally “four-footed.” This equivalent reflects the understanding that בהמה represents all quadrupeds or all animals,¹⁵ and not necessarily “cattle.” The equivalent τετράποδος is applied to only seven occurrences of בהמה in Scripture, among them one further verse in Genesis.¹⁶ However, in Gen 1:24, this

14 In the Greek Genesis, all occurrences refer to the base meaning of הכה, namely, “to strike in order to kill,” with one exception, 19:11 (“to strike”).

15 See the analysis in *HALOT*. In 1 Kings 5:13 בהמה is mentioned next to birds, creeping things, and fishes and in Gen 6:7 next to creeping things and birds. In the sense of “all animals” the word is used in Exod 9:9, 25, Jer 36:29, and elsewhere.

16 Gen 34:23; Exod 9:9; Lev 7:21, 27:27; Job 12:7; 18:3; 35:11. In Isa 40:16 this word represents חיה.

equivalent is inappropriate, as it comes after the mentioning of the animals of the field, חיה, which are also four-footed. The inappropriateness of this translation is shown by the next verse, 25,¹⁷ where in the execution of the command of v. 24, a different (and appropriate) equivalent is used, ατήνη, reflecting a different understanding of בהמה, viz., “cattle.” The equivalent “quadrupeds” is not correct either in Gen 34:23.¹⁸ The standard LXX equivalent of בהמה is ατήνος, employed everywhere else in Genesis (19×).¹⁹

The preliminary nature of the Genesis translation is manifest in this equivalent that was abandoned at an early stage of the translation, although it returns once, in 34:22.²⁰

4. The usual translation of מים, a plural form, is ὕδωρ, “water,” in the singular. This equivalent indeed occurs in Gen 1:1–9 and from Gen 6:17 until the end of the book. However, in vv. 10, 20–21, the plural ὕδατα is used. It is difficult to know whether this plural form is intentional, meant to express the plurality of the “gather of waters” (thus *NJPS*) of v. 10 and of “let the waters bring forth” of vv. 20 and 21 (thus *NJPS*; *KJV* has “waters” all along for all appearances of מים in the creation story and often elsewhere). If the plural form is not intentional, it reflects the translator’s uncertainty about the rendering in the beginning of the book.²¹
5. The first equivalent of עַם in Genesis (11:6) is γένος, followed by five additional instances of this equivalent and five instances of ἔθνος. However,

¹⁷ The same equivalent is used in v. 26.

¹⁸ In this verse, בהמה occurs next to מקנה. Since the latter word was rendered by ατήνη, the translator could not use that word, the standard equivalent of בהמה, choosing “quadrupeds” instead. It is unclear why in Lev 7:21 and 27:27 בהמה is rendered by “quadrupeds,” while the same phrase in 5:5; 27:11 and Num 18:15 is translated by the standard equivalent of בהמה, viz., ατήνος.

¹⁹ Likewise the Greek translation of Exodus uses the equivalent “quadrupeds” in the beginning of the book, 8:13–14, 9:9–10. In this case, the Greek rendering constitutes an appropriate equivalent, which is not continued in the next verses and elsewhere in Exodus. If our explanation is correct, it could imply that the books of Genesis and Exodus were translated simultaneously, because in both books new insights were reached after the beginning of the translation.

²⁰ The background of this equivalent reflects the translator’s choice of equivalents. It should not be linked with the vocabulary of Plato’s *Timaios*, since the similarities between the LXX of Genesis identified by Rösel, *Genesis-Septuaginta*, 47 may be correct for this context, but not for the other verses in which this equivalent appears.

²¹ In the Greek Psalms the plural form occurs more frequently than the singular. It also occurs occasionally elsewhere, especially in poetic passages.

the main equivalent in this book is *λαός* (19×). In the remainder of the LXX the translators settled on *ἔθνος* and *λαός*, reverting rarely to *γένος*. No difference in meaning between *γένος*, *λαός* and *ἔθνος* is visible in Genesis,²² yet the very first equivalent did not become standard in the translation.

6. The first occurrence of *משפחה* in Genesis (8:19) is rendered by *γένος*. This equivalent occurs elsewhere in the LXX only once (Jer 31[38]1), and instead, *φυλή* is used 11 times in the later chapters of Genesis as well as elsewhere in the LXX. The similar formulations of 8:19 and 10:5–32 in Hebrew, contrasted by different words in Greek (8:19 *φυλή*; 10:5–32 *γένος*) show that probably no different meaning was intended by the translator.
7. The adverb *אוֹלִי* (“maybe”) is rendered in different ways, rarely as an adverb (*ἴσως*) as in Gen 32:21, and more frequently as a conjunction. The translator of Genesis, as well as the other ones, represented *אוֹלִי* with a conjunction, both when occurring at the beginning of a main sentence, and when occurring between two main sentences, making the second sentence subordinate to the first one by the use of a conjunction. Against this background we note that the first occurrence of *אוֹלִי* in Genesis (16:2) is rendered by *ἵνα*, an equivalent that is rare in the LXX, recurring only in Exod 32:30. Among the conjunctions used for *אוֹלִי*, *ἐὰν δέ* is the most frequent one used in Genesis (5×), together with *μήποτε* (3×). In the subsequent books, *εἴ* / *ἐάν* (*πῶς*) become the most frequent equivalents (16×). The evidence shows that the very first equivalent of *אוֹלִי* in Genesis, *ἵνα*, did not become the major LXX rendering.
8. In its first occurrence (1:31)²³ the phrase *כָּל אֲשֶׁר* is rendered by *τὰ πάντα ὅσα* with the article, while afterwards it is always rendered without the article (some 200 times in the LXX, of which 16× in Genesis).
9. *Frequency of δέ in the translation.* *δέ* occurs for the first time in the very beginning of the book (1:2 ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος ...) indicating that the use of this particle was known to the translator. Yet, the translator “limits the use of *δέ* to specific constructions, such as expository clauses with fronted subject, contrastive clauses, the alternation of speaker and respondent, and surprising developments.”²⁴ Because of the translator’s limited use of *δέ* in the beginning of the translation enterprise, the narrative chapters in the beginning of Genesis contain only a few occurrences of *δέ* (chapter 1, 1 instance; chapter 2, 7 instances; chapter 3, 3 instances; chapter 4,

²² For example in 26:10 and 11, Abimelek’s people is named both *γένος* (v. 10) and *λαός* (v. 11).

²³ In this verse the phrase is preceded by *אֵל* as often elsewhere.

²⁴ Thus F.H. Polak, “Context Sensitive Translation and Parataxis in Biblical Narrative,” in Paul, *Emanuel*, 525–539 (536).

13 instances), while the later chapters such as the Joseph cycle contain much more (chapter 37, 36 instances; chapter 38, 29 instances; chapter 39, 11 instances; chapter 40, 11 instances; chapter 41, 33 instances).²⁵ We therefore accept the view of Polak that the recognition of the rendering of the *waw* not only by *καί*, but also by *δέ* “develops gradually in the first twelve chapters of Genesis and is in full use in Exodus.”²⁶ The internal differences between the chapters of Genesis can also be shown through an analysis of specific phrases. Thus, the use of *καὶ ἐγένετο* (and sim.) for *ויהי* is employed from 1:3 onwards (32× in ch. 1–10, 1× in ch. 11, and 23× in ch. 12–50), while *ἐγένετο δέ* (and sim.) appears only from 12:11 onwards (48× between 12:11 and 48:1).²⁷ Phrased differently, between 1:3 and 11:2 *καὶ ἐγένετο* occurs 33 times without competition of *ἐγένετο δέ*, while from 12:11 onwards the latter equivalent occurs 48 times, while *καὶ ἐγένετο* continues to be used, but less so (23×). The same applies to the rendering of *ויהי* + specific time phrases and *ויהי* + specific infinitives.²⁸ One gets the impression that at a certain point, around chapter 12, the translator understood that the use of *δέ* would represent the source text better.

10. The first occurrence of the root *דבר* is rendered by *εἶπον* (8:15), which is unusual since *λαλέω* is the majority equivalent of this root in Genesis (59× in ch. 12–50)²⁹ and elsewhere in the LXX. At the same time, *εἶπον* is the standard equivalent of *אמר* in Genesis (521×) and elsewhere in the LXX.

25 Because of the different length of the chapters in Genesis it is probably preferable to count the number of occurrences per 1000 words, which are 1.20, 1.67, 4.62, and 21.31 for chapters 1–4 as opposed to 41.86, 38.46, 17.27, 20.30, 25.88 for chapters 37–41. These details were calculated with the aid of the *Accordance* computer program. On the whole, Genesis is among the books frequently using *δέ*. See the statistics of N. Turner in J.H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1963), 111.332. According to the *Accordance* computer program, the statistics are as follows per 1000 words for the complete books: Genesis 23.20, Proverbs 37.18, Job 41.65, as opposed to 1.0 to 5.0 for most books.

26 This conclusion does not contradict the view of Aejmelaesus that Genesis contains a relatively large number of instances of *δέ*, since (1) these statistics include the latter chapters of the book, (2) Genesis is longer than the other books of the Torah, and (3) Genesis is almost completely narrative, as opposed to the other Torah books. See Aejmelaesus, *Parataxis*, 34–47; eadem, *Trail*, 57.

27 Baab, “Theory,” 241 used these data as an argument for his theory that Genesis was translated by two different translators.

28 See Hayeon Kim, *Multiple Authorship*, 138–139.

29 There are several exceptions, especially when two words of the root *דבר* occur in the same verse: *εἰπεῖν* (18:5; 23:3, 13; 41:28; 42:14, 24; 44:2; 45:27); *ἀντειπεῖν* (24:50).

The occurrence of εἶπον in 8:15 thus indicates that the equivalent of דבר was not yet fixed when that word occurred for the first time in Genesis.

11. The first occurrence of לָב is rendered by καρδία (8:15), which is also its main equivalent in Exodus and elsewhere in the LXX. However, in Genesis διάνοια serves as the main equivalent (7×),³⁰ showing that in ch. 8 the translator had not yet settled on a fixed equivalent.
12. The first occurrence of דמות is rendered by ὁμοίωσις (1:26), while in 5:1, 3 the translator used different equivalents, εἰκών and ἰδέα.
13. The first translation of עַל כֵּן is ἔνεαεν τούτου (2:24), followed by the same translation in 6:14; 20:6; 32:33; 41:22; Ezek 7:20; 31:5; 44:12; Hos 13:6; Hab 1:4, 15, 16; Prov 7:15. However, elsewhere the translator of Genesis uses the equivalent that was to become the main LXX equivalent of this Hebrew phrase, διὰ τοῦτο from 10:9 onwards (14×). The translator of Genesis used also another equivalent: οὐ ἔνεαεν (19:8; 38:26).
14. The first translation of עַל פְּנֵי with ἐπάνω (1:2) represents an excellent translation equivalent, recurring in 1:29 and 7:18. Other equivalents used in the first chapters are κατὰ (1:20), ἐπὶ (6:1; 7:3), ἐναντίον (10:9), as well as ἀπέναντι in the later chapters (23:19; 25:9; 49:30) and κατέναντι (50:13). However, from 4:14 onwards, the translator more frequently rendered עַל פְּנֵי with a literal representation of the components of this phrase: ἀπὸ προσώπου, ἐπὶ προσώπῳ, ἐπὶ προσώπου, ἐπὶ πρόσωπον, κατὰ πρόσωπον. Equivalents of this type became standard in the later books of the LXX,³¹ but in Genesis we still witness the doubts of the translator regarding the best equivalent.
15. The main equivalent in the LXX of לְבַלְתִּי is τοῦ μὴ (42×), also in Genesis (4:15; 19:21; 38:9). However, the first occurrence of this word (3:11) was rendered by μὴ only.
16. The two types of מנחה are usually well separated in the LXX, θυσία for cultic sacrifices (animals and grains) and δῶρον for profane gifts.³² This distinction can be examined only partially in Genesis, since with the exception of the story of Kain and Abel, this book contains only examples of the profane מנחה, rendered by δῶρον.³³ However, in the one place where the two cultic usages of מנחה occur together, in the very beginning of the book, the equivalents differ from the ones to be used in the later

30 Καρδία occurs also twice in Genesis, towards the end of the book, in 42:48 and 50:21.

31 See Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 102–113.

32 See the detailed discussion of S. Daniel, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire du culte dans la Septante* (Études et Commentaires LXI; Paris, 1966), 201–223.

33 32:14, 19, 21, 22; 33:10; 43:11, 15, 25, 26.

chapters and elsewhere in the LXX: *θυσία* (4:3, 5) for the cultic, non-animal offer, and *δῶρον* (4:4) for the animal sacrifice. To be sure, *θυσία* is also used elsewhere for the non-animal offer, for example the flour offer (e.g., Leviticus 2; Num 15:4), but this meaning occurs less frequently in the LXX. In the special situation in chapter 4, the equivalents are understandable in light of the use of *δῶρον* in Leviticus and Numbers for the animal sacrifice, this time rendering קרבן. Accordingly, when the first translator used *θυσία* for the non-animal offer in 4:3, 5, this interpretation is matched by other renderings, but it did not become the majority rendering in Genesis and elsewhere.³⁴

17. When ען occurs for the first time in Genesis (4:13) it is rendered by αἰτία, a good rendering, but not used elsewhere (this word occurs only three times in the LXX, with unclear equivalents in MT).³⁵ In the subsequent chapters, the LXX of Genesis uses three different equivalents, all of which represent the main equivalents of ען in the later books of the LXX: ἀμαρτία (15:16), ἀνομία (19:15), ἁδικία (44:16).
18. When קרא occurs for the first time together with שם, the translator rendered the two words with a single verb that covered both (4:17 ויקרא שם העיר—καὶ ἐπωνόμασεν τὴν πόλιν).³⁶ However, in all next occurrences of this phrase in Genesis (11×), Exodus (5×), Numbers (1×), and Deuteronomy (1×), the translators added ὄνομα to ἐπονομάζω.
19. Chapter 1 reflects four different types of understanding נפש חיה: ψυχῶν ζώσων (1:20); ψυχῇ ζώων (1:21); ψυχῇ ζῶσα (1:24); ψυχῇ ζῶης (1:30). However, from 2:7 onwards the translator settled on a single rendering, ψυχῇ ζῶσα (2:7, 19; 9:10, 12, 15, 16).
20. The first equivalent of מאד in Genesis is λίαν (1:31; 4:5), while the next equivalents in that book are σφόδρα and (rarely) σφοδρώς (32× between 7:18 and 50:10). Likewise in all of the LXX, σφόδρα (σφοδρώς) is by far the main equivalent as against a mere 6 occurrences of λίαν.

34 The special equivalents in chapter 4 probably reflect the translator's wish to use different equivalents for the מנחה of Cain and Abel. According to Daniel, *Recherches*, 209–210, the translator wished to use a more appealing word for Abel's offer (*δῶρον*), thus indicating why God preferred his offer. This explanation is possible, but it is more likely that the translator started off with *θυσία* for מנחה, and then had almost no choice but to use *δῶρον* for Abel's offer, varying his equivalents.

35 Prov 28:17; Job 18:14.

36 Similarly Josh 7:26.

2 The Septuagint of Genesis Uses an Equivalent That Was Not Accepted in the Later Translation Units

In the following examples, the translator of Genesis used equivalents that were abandoned in the next translation units. The first eight examples pertain to translation equivalents, and the last four to categories of translation technique.

1. In ten of the eleven occurrences of ברא in Genesis, this root is rendered by ποιέω, and once by ἄρχομαι (2:3).³⁷ The rendering ברא—ποιέω is continued in the next books (6×), but several other equivalents are used in these books as well, among which κτίζω is the major one (15×). By and large, the equivalent initiated in Genesis, ποιέω, has not been accepted by the later translators.
2. The first occurrence of γάρ representing כי *causale* (Gen 2:5) shows the free character of this equivalent, since the post-position of γάρ does not preserve in Greek the Hebrew word sequence. This occurrence is followed by many identical ones in Genesis and Exodus. However, this equivalent was abandoned for ὅτι in most subsequent books, in which this construction occurs rarely or not at all, while occurring frequently in Isaiah, Job, Proverbs, and Esther.³⁸
3. From Gen 1:4 onwards, καλός is by far (31×) the leading equivalent of טוב in Genesis. Exceptions are ὠραίος (26:7), βελτίων for the comparative טוב –ב (29:19), ὁρθῶς for the adverbial use (40:16), and “good in the eyes of” (16:6; 19:8; 20:15). Ἀγαθός is used 3× for טוב, noun (24:10; 45:18, 23). However, in the later books of the LXX ἀγαθός has become the major equivalent of טוב. For example, in Deuteronomy ἀγαθός appears 17× next to 6 occurrences of καλός, and in 1–2 Samuel ἀγαθός is the only equivalent. Even if slight differences between the base meanings of the two Greek words are recognizable in the Greek literature, they are not reflected in the LXX of Genesis, where the equivalent of טוב differs from most LXX books.³⁹

37 This equivalent was chosen in 2:3 because the main equivalent of ποιέω, עשה, occurred in the immediate vicinity: אשר ברא אלהים לעשות.

38 The statistics, contrasted with those of ὅτι are culled from *Accordance* and are mentioned in Aejmelaeus, *Trail*, 26–27.

39 On the other hand, A. Schmitt, “Interpretation der Genesis aus hellenistischem Geist,” *ZAW* 86 (1974), 151 and M. Harl, *La Bible d’Alexandrie, I. La Genèse* (Paris: Cerf, 1986), 88 assign an esthetic and moral value to this word. Similarly P. Prestel & S. Schorch in *Septuaginta Deutsch, Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament* (ed. M. Karrer & W. Kraus; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 1.88.

4. In the creation story הַבְּדִיל is consistently and appropriately rendered by διαχωρίζω (1:4, 6, 7, 14, 18). This equivalent does not recur elsewhere in the LXX. It would probably be best to analyze the same phrase as used in Genesis, that is הַבְּדִיל בֵּין וּבֵין. In this usage, the verb is rendered only by different Greek verbs: διορίζω (Exod 26:33), διαστέλλω (Lev 10:10; 11:47; Ezek 42:20), ἀφορίζω (Lev 20:25).
5. By far the most frequent rendering in all of the LXX of שְׁלוֹם is εἰρήνη, also when this word occurs in the meaning “well-being” (e.g., 2 Sam 11:7). However, the translator of Genesis did not yet use a stereotyped equivalent: εἰρήνη (2×), εἰρηναίος (1×), σωτηρία (2×), σωτήριον (1×), ὑγιαίνω (5×), ἰλεως (1×), πῶς ἔχω (1×).
6. The major translation of חָרָה in the LXX is ὀργίζομαι, with θυμῶ as a second choice. In Genesis, eight different renderings are used, of which ὀργίζομαι is merely one (31:36). Other equivalents are θυμῶ (30:2; 39:19; 44:18); λυπέω (4:5); περίλυπος/λυπηρὸς γίνομαι/εἶμι (4:6; 34:7); βαρέως φέρω (31:35); σκληρὸν φαίνομαι (45:5); no equivalent (18:30, 32). It thus seems that the translator was trying out different options. When the Hebrew verb occurs for the first time (4:5), it is rendered as a transitive Greek verb, unlike all other instances.⁴⁰
7. The first equivalent of the verb פָּרַשׁ differs from all subsequent ones that also reflect a different understanding of the root: In 1:20, 21, the translator ascribed to the Hebrew the meaning “bring forth” (ἐξάγω), possibly in conjunction with v. 24 תּוֹצֵא—ἐξαγαγέτω. In v. 20 the Greek rendering of the verb also differs from its object, the noun פָּרָשׁ (ἐρπετά, “creeping, crawling things”). Elsewhere פָּרַשׁ is rendered by other verbs, ἐξερεύγω (Exod 7:28), ἐρεύγω (Lev 11:10), ἔρπω (Lev 11:31, 41–46), ἐχζέω (Ezek 47:9), and ἐξέρπω (Ps 105:30).
8. κατὰ γένος καὶ κατ’ ὁμοιότητα in 1:11 (no Hebrew equivalent, but probably reflecting למינהו) and 1:12 (למינהו) reflect an unusual exegesis of the Hebrew, once as expected, “according to its species,” and once as “according to similar species.” The latter rendering, involving ὁμοιότης, does not occur elsewhere in the canonical books of the LXX, but undoubtedly reflects the same exegesis as למינו—τὰ ὅμοια in Lev 11:14, 15. Probably an earlier understanding, “similar species,” was juxtaposed by way of replacement in the LXX of vv. 11 and 12 by another rendering, κατὰ γένος, such as occurred elsewhere in the book: v. 12b; 1:21, 24, 25; 6:20; 7:14.⁴¹

40 פָּרַשׁ—καὶ ἐλύπησεν τὸν Καϊν.

41 Our understanding is based on the “rule” of de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen*, 3, assuming that

9. Together with a few free translations in the LXX (Isaiah 25 [2]; Job 22 [3]; Proverbs 19), Genesis has the largest number of occurrences of the verb ἔχω, a verb that has no exact equivalent in Hebrew, 24 [5].⁴²
10. Genesis, together with Isaiah, Proverbs, and Job, differs from the other books in the Pentateuch in the relatively frequent use of the enclitic personal pronoun placed before nouns and verbs against the sequence of the Hebrew (e.g. Gen 12:1 τὴν γῆν ἣν ἄν σοι δέξω).⁴³
11. The LXX of Genesis renders the Hebrew *infinitive absolute* constructions differently from the next four books of the Pentateuch. This translator used two main Greek equivalents interchangeably (noun—15 times, participle—14 times),⁴⁴ whereas in the other Pentateuch books, the noun was much preferred to the participle (Exodus 28–7, Leviticus 22–8, Numbers 18–8, and Deuteronomy 24–10). In an earlier study I suggested that the translator of Genesis was still searching for the right type of rendering for this Hebrew construction.⁴⁵
12. Coordinate clauses (*parataxis*) are often rendered in the LXX by the *participium coniunctum* construction (*hypotaxis*), e.g. Gen 24:63 וישא עיניו וירא—καὶ ἀναβλέψας τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ εἶδεν. Genesis displays the largest percentage of these constructions within the LXX, implying that in the later books this elegant construction, used by the first translator, was considered less appropriate than a literal Greek translation of the Hebrew *parataxis*. Such a literal rendering is preferred in the books from Joshua onwards, e.g. 1 Sam 6:13 ויראו את עניהם ויראו—καὶ ἦραν ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ εἶδον.⁴⁶

many translation doublets in the LXX consist of a free and a literal rendering, and that in such cases the literal one was juxtaposed to the free one as a replacement.

- 42 Occurrences of ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχω as well as the prepositions ἐχόμενος, ἐχόμενα ("near"), indicated in brackets, need to be deducted from this number. See further I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax* (AASF B 237; Helsinki, 1987), 181–188 (185).
- 43 See A. Wifstrand, "Die Stellung der enklitischen Personalpronomina bei den Septuaginta," *Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund* (Lund, 1950): 50–52.
- 44 E.g., Gen 43:3 העד העד—διαμαρτυρία διαμεμαρτυρήται; Gen 3:4 מות תמותן—θανάτω ἀποθανείσθε.
- 45 E. Tov, "Renderings of Combinations of the Infinitive Absolute Construction and Finite Verbs in the LXX: Their Nature and Distribution," in idem, *Greek-Hebrew Bible*, 247–256 (255).
- 46 See I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (AASF B 132, 1; Helsinki, 1965), 177–178; Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis*, 179.

3 Summary

Although our non-exhaustive collection of examples is based on the in-depth reading of only the first chapters of Genesis, we believe that they show that that translation, presumably the first one among the Greek translations, displays signs of internal development in both individual translation equivalents and grammatical categories (section 1 summarized in Table 1). In these cases the translator initially chose one translation option, but subsequently settled on another one. This second stage differs from case to case, rendering it impossible to indicate at which point the second rendering(s) were employed. Likewise, the unstable rendering of the divine names in Genesis 1–11 is partly due to the fact that these chapters were translated first, although a blend of harmonizing tendencies and inconsistency were more influential.⁴⁷

Section 2 summarized in Table 2 showed how translation equivalents and categories in translation technique adopted in Genesis were not followed in the next translation units.

TABLE 1 *Differences between the first and subsequent equivalents in Genesis*

	First equivalents, usually in chapters 1–10	Subsequent equivalents ⁴⁸
הבה	ἀναίρέω 4:12	*πατάσσω from 8:21 (5×) κατακόπτω from 14:5 (2×) ἐκκόπτω from 32:8 (2×) συγκόπτω 34:30
יְלִיד	νεανίσκος 4:23	*παιδίον from 21:8 (13×) *παιδάριον from 33:14 (3×) υἱός 33:2 τέκνον 33:6, 7
בהמה	τετράποδος (1:24; 34:22)	*κτήνος from 1:25 (19×)
מים	ὑδωρ (Gen 1:1–9; Gen 6:17–49:4) ὑδατα (1:10, 20–21)	*ὑδωρ or ὑδατα
עם	γένος (11:6)	γένος from 17:14 (5×) *λαός from 14:16 (19×)

47 See ch. 31 in this volume: “The Harmonizing Character of the Septuagint of Genesis 1–11.”

48 A star indicates the main rendering in the book, the LXX, or both.

TABLE 1 *Differences between the first and subsequent equivalents in Genesis (cont.)*

	First equivalents, usually in chapters 1–10	Subsequent equivalents
משפחה	γένος (8:19)	γένος from 17:14 to 35:29 (5×)
אולי	ἵνα (16:2)	*φυλή from 10:5 (11×)
		*ἐάν δέ from 18:24 (5×)
		μήποτε from 24:39 (3×)
		ἴσως (32:21)
כל אשר	τὰ πάντα ὅσα (1:31)	*from 2:19 without the article (16×)
δέ	infrequent (ch. 1–11)	*frequent in ch. 12–50
ויהי	*καὶ ἐγένετο (and sim.) from 1:3 (32× in ch. 1–10)	ἐγένετο δέ (and sim.)
	ἐγένετο δέ (and sim.) (23× in ch. 12–50)	*ἐγένετο δέ (and sim.) (48× in ch. 12–50)
דב"ר	εἶπον (8:15)	εἶπον (9× in ch. 12–50)
		*λαλέω (59× in ch. 12–50)
לב	καρδία (8:15)	καρδία 42:48; 50:21
	διάνοια (8:21)	*διάνοια ch. 17–50 (6×)
דמות	ὁμοίωσις (1:26)	εἰκῶν (5:1)
		ἰδέα (5:3)
על כן	ἐνεκεν τούτου (2:24; 6:14)	ἐνεκεν τούτου (20:6; 32:33; 41:22)
		*διὰ τοῦτο from 10:9 (14×)
על פני	ἐπάνω (1:2; 1:29; 7:18)	ἀπέναντι (23:19; 25:9; 49:30)
	κατά (1:20)	κατέναντι (50:13)
	ἐπὶ (6:1; 7:3)	*ἐπὶ προσώπου (11:4)
	ἐναντίον (10:9)	*ἐπὶ πρόσωπον 7× (ch. 11–50)
	*ἀπὸ προσώπου 4× (ch. 4–8)	*κατὰ πρόσωπον (32:22)
	*ἐπὶ προσώπῳ (8:9)	
	*ἐπὶ προσώπου (7:23)	
לבלתי	μή (3:18)	*τοῦ μή (19:21; 38:9)
	τοῦ μή (4:15)	
מנחה (cultic, non-animal)	θυσία (4:3, 5)	
מנחה (animal sacrifice)	δῶρον (4:4)	*after Genesis: θυσία

	First equivalents, usually in chapters 1–10	Subsequent equivalents
עון	αἰτία (4:13)	*ἀμαρτία (15:16) *ἀνομία (19:15) *ἀδικία (44:16)
קרא שם	ἐπωνομάζω (4:17)	*ἐπωνομάζω + ὄνομα 6× (ch. 21–30)
	*ἐπωνομάζω + ὄνομα 4× (4:26–5:29)	
נפש חיה	ψυχῶν ζώων (1:20) ψυχῇ ζώων (1:21) ψυχῇ ζῶσα (1:24) ψυχῇ ζωῆς (1:30) *ψυχῇ ζῶσα (2:7, 19; 9:10, 12, 15, 16)	
מאד	λίαν (1:31; 4:5) *σφόδρα/σφοδρῶς (7:18, 19)	*σφόδρα 30× (ch. 12–50)

TABLE 2 *Differences between the equivalents of Genesis and of the later books*

	Genesis	Later books
ברא	ποιέω 10× (ch. 1–6)	ποιέω (6×) *κτίζω (15×)
בי causale	γάρ (post-position) 2:5	*ὅτι
טוב	καλός 31× (1:4–49:15) ώραῖος (26:7) βελτίων (29:19) ὀρθῶς (40:16) “good in the eyes of” (16:6; 19:8; 20:15)	*ἀγαθός
הבדיל בין ובין	διαχωρίζω 5× (ch. 1)	διορίζω (Exod 26:33) διαστέλλω (Lev 10:10; 11:47; Ezek 42:20) ἀφορίζω (Lev 20:25)

TABLE 2 *Differences between the equivalents of Genesis and of the later books (cont.)*

	Genesis	Later books
שלום	εἰρήνη (2×) εἰρηνικός (37:4) σωτηρία (2×) σωτήριον (41:16) ὕγιαίνω (5×) ἵλεως (43:23) πῶς ἔχω (43:27)	*εἰρήνη
no fixed equivalent or no equivalent	1. ἔχω: Together with three other books, Genesis has the most occurrences of this verb. 2. Together with three other books, Genesis has the most occurrences of enclitic personal pronouns placed before nouns and verbs. 3. Genesis has the most occurrences of the <i>participium coniunctum</i> construction.	
חרה	βαρέως φέρω (31:35) θυμόω from 30:2 (3×) λυπέω (4:5) ὀργίζομαι (31:36) περίλυπος/λυπηρός γίνομαι/εἶμι (4:6; 34:7) σκληρόν φαίνομαι (45:5)	*ὀργίζομαι *θυμόω
רש	ἐξάγω (1:20, 21)	ἐξερεύγω (Exod 7:28) ἐρεύγω (Lev 11:10) ἔρπω (Lev 11:31, 41–46) ἐκζέω (Ezek 47:9) ἐξέρπω (Ps 105:30)

Index of Ancient Sources

Old Testament

Masoretic Text

Gen

1–11	169, 470
1:1–9	509
1:14	37
1:15	37
1:16	37
2:14	423
3:23	42
4:26	488n31
5	245n21
5:1–32	221
5:8, 11, 14, 17	235
5:32	225n5, 230n11
7:6	225n5, 230n11
7:11	238n22
8:14	238n22
9:28	225n5
9:29	225n5
10:4	193
11	245n21
11:10–32	221
11:11, 15, 17	235
11:13	234, 235
11:32	232n13
12–50	172, 479
14:14	201
16:16	232n15
21:5	232n15
25:7	232n16
25:18	424
28:6	55
30:26	54
30:36	390n9
33:19	203n48
39	168
47:21	200
49:7	200
50:2	435n22

Exod

1:5	362n39
4:9	41
7–11	16, 251, 391n10
8:19	16n41
12:48	39

15	316, 326, 335n20, 503
19:17	55
20	54
20:2–17	207
20:11	15n38
20:21	390n9
23:19b	48n10
24:12	55
24:18	55
Lev	
11:17	435n22
15:14–15	56
18:25–29	56
19:1–4	56
19:9–15	56
23:42–43	47
23:44	47
24:1–2	47
24:20–22	56
25:39–43	56
Num	481
4:47–49	56
6:24–26	207
10:35–36	156n6
20:13	360
21:12	360
24:17	201
24:22	424
27:11	55, 394
27:23	360
29:32–30:1	47
36:1–2	55, 394
Deut	209
1–3	15, 390n10
2:8	54
4:45	207
5	208n14, 246n26
5:6–21	207
5:28–31	54
5:30–31	393
5:31	394
6	208n14
7:15	363
8	208, 246n26
8:12	363
9:2	363

Deut (<i>cont.</i>)		2:22	30n39
10	208n14, 246n26	2:23–24	358n16
11	208n14, 246n26	10:25	75
11:29	15n40	16–18	7, 9, 26
11:30	15n40	17	126
12	213	20:30	199
12:20–25	311	2Sam	24n20
12:20–28	214	1:1–11:1	357
13:7–11	205	4:1	358n16
16:13–14	47	4:2	358n16
18:18–22	54, 390n9	4:12	358n16
24:1–4	76n38	10:1	24n15
27:2–3	15n40	11:1–1Kgs 2:11	23
27:4	15n40	11:1–24:25	358
27:5–7	15n40	11:2	24, 24n15
32	208n14, 246n26, 316, 326, 330, 335n20	11:2–1Kgs 2:1	436
32:3	129	1Kgs	8, 241, 310
32:5	130	2:11	24
32:43	356	3–11	8
33:8–11	361	3:1	9
Josh	242	5:7–8	9
1:8	29n36	5:31–32	9
7:24	413n4	6:37–38	9
8:11–13	134	8:11–12	9
8:14–17	134	9:16–17	9
12:9–24	335n20	10:1	24
20:1–6	140	11	9, 126
8:30–35	148, 149n60	11–14	8
Judg	240	11:5	129
1:15	263	12	9
1:22	263	14	9
1:34–35	143	16–22	8
2:20	263	16:34	142
5:2–30	335n20	22	24
6:7–10	259	22–2Kgs 25	23, 436
20:1	262	22:41–51	8
1–2Sam	28, 42, 242	2Kgs	481
1Sam	357	5:12	193
1–2	29	18:13–20:11	169
1:22	202	20:1–11	350
1:23	29n37	22:8	73, 74
1:24	29n37, 198	23:2	74
1:25	29n37	24:2	74
1:28	29n37	24:15	193
2:1–10	126	24:18–25:30	169
2:4–8	29n38	25:5	413n4
2:9a	29, 30n38	Isa	87
2:11	29n37	7:14	457
		7:25	201

8:1	413	29:22	33n58
8:3	413	29:24	33n58
9:11	420	29:25	33n57
10:9	421	29:27	33n58, 33n62
11:11	426	29:29	33n57, 33n58, 33n63
11:15	198	29:30	33n58, 33n62
16:7	426	29:31	33n57
25:8	460	42:2	34n65
27:12	421	43:6	34n65
33:9	422	45:1	34n65
36:1–38:8	169	51:59	34n65
37:38	422	52	169
40:7–8	39	Ezek	241
45:2	193, 196	1–27	25
45:14	419	1–3	88
46:1	422	1:1	130
47:2	201	1:3	76n40, 130
47:8	344	28–39	25
49:12	422	40–48	25
52:14–53:14	458	Jon	
59:21	29n36	2	126
60:6	466	Hab	
Jer	7, 16n42, 87, 241, 481	1–2	218
1–28	25	Ps	240
1–3	88	1–89	209n24
1:1	76n39	1:2	29n36
3:1–2	76n38	5:10	464
10:5–12	356	14	31, 32, 130
27	34, 126	14:2	31n42
27–29	32, 34	14:3	464
27:1	33n58	14:4	31n42
27:3	33n58, 130	14:7	31n42
27:12	33n57	14:10	464
27:20	33n57	22:17	192
28–29	34	32	211
28:1	33n57, 34n66	38	311
28:4	33n57	40:7	464
28:5	33n57, 33n63, 34n66	40:14	31n42
28:6	33n57, 33n63	40:17	31n42
28:10	33n57, 33n63, 34n66	42–72	30
28:11	33n57, 33n63	43:4	31n42
28:12	33n57, 33n62, 34n66	45:8	31n42
28:13	33n57	50:7	31n42
28:15	33n57, 33n63, 34n66	53	31, 32, 130
28:17	33n57, 34n66	53:3	31n42
29:1	33n57, 33n63	53:3–7	31
29:2	33n57	53:5	31n42
29:3	33n57	53:7	31n42
29:21	32, 33n57, 33n58	70:2	31n42

Ps (*cont.*)

70:5	31n42
71	311
73–89	30
82:1	31n42
84–89	30n41
84–85	30n41
90–150	209n24
104	333n17
119	316, 326, 328, 330, 333n17
139:5	191
145	210n27
Job	240
Prov	241
Cant	241
3:6–8	311
4:4–7	311
Ruth	240
Lam	240, 325
Eccl	240
Esth	102, 241, 310
2:7	11n24
6:14	103
9:6–9	335n20
Dan	241, 310
3:31–33	12
3:33	12n31
3:34	12
4–6	11
4	12
5	8
11:30	422
Ezr	
1–10	7n10
Neh	
8:1–12	7n10
10:35	47
13:31	47
1–2 Chr	19, 19n47, 29n35, 42, 241
1 Chr	
1:8	230n12
1:24	230n12
2:47–49	85
8:17–22	85
2 Chr	
26:21	193
34:15	74
34:30	74
35–36	7n10

Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert

Qumran

1QDeut ^a	246, 246n28
1QDeut ^b	327
1QJudg	259
1QSam	342
1QIsa ^a	39, 40, 65, 70, 89n35, 159n16, 196, 198, 201, 219, 241, 246, 277n45, 277n46, 278, 284n74, 302, 309, 340, 342, 344, 350, 368–386
1QIsa ^b	65, 196, 197, 241n6, 302, 303, 316, 340, 344
1QPs ^a	327
2QExod ^b	45
2QNum ^a	161n22
2QDeut ^c	353n1, 363
2QJer	241
3QLam	328
4QGen–Exod ^a	53n32, 362n39
4Q[Gen–]Exod ^b	245, 246n28, 249
4QpaleoGen–Exod ^l	53n32, 161n22, 301
4QGen ^b	37, 42, 53n32, 161n22, 292, 301, 315n17
4QGen ^c	178
4QGen ^e	53n32
4QGen ^g	37, 301
4QGen ^h	52n26
4QGen ^k	37, 52n26, 171, 245n23
4QExod ^b	53n32, 362, 362n39
4QExod ^c	41n8, 161n22, 292, 301
4QExod ^d	45, 245n23, 311
4QExod ^e	53n32
4QExod–Lev ^f	20n2, 53n32, 244n20, 306, 392, 394
4QpaleoExod ^m	14n33, 16n41, 20n2, 161, 161n22, 291, 292, 306–308, 354n1, 388, 391, 392n17, 394
4QLev–Num ^a	53n32
4QLev ^d	20n2, 362
4QNum ^b	14n33, 20n2, 55, 244, 246, 277n45, 306, 308, 354n1, 359, 392, 394
4QDeut ^b	129, 327
4QDeut ^c	245, 249, 327

4QDeut ^g	161n22	4QpaleoJob ^c	328
4QDeut ^h	245, 247n32, 249, 361, 362	4QCant ^a	49, 57, 203, 241, 310
4QDeut ⁱ	39, 209, 245, 246, 246n28, 311	4QCant ^b	49, 57, 241, 278n53, 310
4QDeut ^{k1}	161n22, 209, 245, 246, 246n28	4QQoh ^a	70
4QDeut ^{k2}	45, 246n28, 246	5QDeut	353n1, 363
4QDeut ^m	246, 246n28	5QKings	353n1
4QDeut ⁿ	15n38, 20n2, 209, 246n28, 284, 311, 404n40	5QPs	60n1, 209, 327
4QDeut ^q	160, 209, 245n23, 248n36, 308, 327, 349, 356	5QLam ^b	328
4QpaleoDeut ^r	306, 327	6QDeut?	45
4QJosh ^a	132, 147, 309, 342n30, 349, 360	8QPs	327
4QJosh ^b	342n30	11QpaleoLev ^a	245, 249, 306
4QJudg ^a	261, 349	11QPs ^a	48, 205, 210, 211n30, 220, 296n30, 328, 333n16, 351, 352, 360, 361
4QJudg ^b	259	11QPs ^b	205
4QSam ^a	23n10, 28, 29, 30n38, 30n39, 160, 199, 202, 242, 267, 290, 309, 313, 342, 347, 349, 354n1, 357, 358	<i>Murabba'at</i>	
4QSam ^b	199, 242, 301, 313, 342, 354n1, 359	MurGen (Muri)	53n32, 161n22
4QSam ^c	162n29, 242, 362	MurNum	161n22
4QIsa ^p	206n6	MurXII	300, 301n19, 302, 315–317
4QIsa ^a	273	<i>Nahal Hever</i>	
4QIsa ^b	302n23	5/6HevPs	161n23, 300, 315, 328
4QIsa ^c	40, 241n6, 305	<i>Nahal Se'elim</i>	
4QIsa ^d	302n23	34SeNum	161n22, 341
4QJer ^a	26, 75n34, 241, 267, 296, 301, 303, 316	<i>Nahal Sdeir</i>	
4QJer ^b	16n42, 26, 75n34, 132, 160, 241, 296, 308, 350, 356	SdeirGen	53n32
4QJer ^c	26, 75n34, 241, 296, 301, 303	<i>Masada</i>	
4QJer ^d	16n42, 26, 75n34, 132, 160, 241, 296, 308, 350, 356	MasLev ^a	161n23
4QPs ^a	205, 211, 220, 311	MasLev ^b	161n23, 299, 300, 315, 317
4QPs ^b	327	MasDeut	53n32, 161n22
4QPs ^c	296, 327	MasEzek	300, 317
4QPs ^d	327	MasPs ^a	32n52, 300, 315, 328
4QPs ^g	60n1, 209, 327	MasPs ^b	328
4QPs ^h	60n1, 209, 327	XJoshua	270n15
4QPs ⁱ	327	XJudges	270n15
4QPs ^q	211	Samaritan Pentateuch	13–15, 155, 160, 163, 167, 169, 172, 182, 189, 191, 195, 203, 206, 212, 216, 217, 220, 244, 250–252, 298, 306–309, 336, 345, 353, 360, 361, 394, 463
4QPs ^w	327	Gen	
4QProv ^a	328	1–11	470
4QProv ^b	301, 328	1:22	253
4QJob ^a	328	1:24	252
		3:3	41
		3:4	41
		4:8	253
		7:2	253
		10:8	42

Gen (*cont.*)

11:31	475
12:3	253
13:6	252
20:14	182
22:23	42
24:16	253
27:5	256
31:39	42n11
46:3	252
47:21	200, 253
49	496
49:7	200, 254
49:15	254
50:25	184

Exod

7-11	167
8:14	254
20:17	393
20:21	362n38

Num

20:13b	392
20:14a	393
21:12a	392
21:13a	392
21:20	392
24:17	201
27:23b	392
32:39	42

Deut

1-3	167
2:8-14	47n9

Ancient Versions

Septuagint

Gen	447, 504
1-11	470
1:2	510
1:24	508
1:31	510
2:4-3:22	486
2:14	423
4:13	508
4:23	508
5:5	509n18
8:19	510
8:21	508
11:3	233n17
11:6	509

11:13	230n12
23:15	442n67
24:43	457
25:18	424
27:11	509n18
32:21	510
34:22	509
39:21-23	442n67
41:34	442n67
47:31	444n74
49	490, 491, 493, 495, 497, 499, 501, 503
49:3	493
49:4	491, 492
49:5	494
49:6	492, 495
49:9	496
49:10	496
49:11	492
49:12	492
49:13	492
49:14	496
49:15	492, 497
49:17	498
49:20	498
49:21	498
49:22	499, 500
49:23	501
49:24	501
49:25	502
49:26	493
49:27	502

Exod

3:7	442n67
35-40	26

Lev

447

Num

447

24:22	424
-------	-----

Deut

447

33:16	493
-------	-----

Josh

23, 26

6:1-20	29n36
--------	-------

6:26	142
------	-----

8-9	146
-----	-----

16:10	136, 143
-------	----------

19:47-48	143
----------	-----

19:48	136
-------	-----

21:42	144
-------	-----

24:31	136, 144
-------	----------

Judg	23, 259	32:2	34n65
1-4 Kgdms	23, 24	34:6	34n65
1-2 Kgdms	28	36:8	34n65
1 Kgdms		36:26	34n65
1-2	29	37:2	34n65
9:3	16	37:3	34n65
2 Kgdms		37:6	34n65
4:10	456	37:13	34n65
3 Kgdms	7, 8, 15, 23, 50, 212	38:9	34n64
2	10, 13, 15, 16	42:2	34n65
2:35a-o	8	42:4	34n65
2:46a-l	8	43:6	34n65
3-10	15	45:1	34n65
4	10	46:1	34n64
5	10	46:13	34n65
5:1	9	47:1	34n64
5:14a	9	49:34	34n64
6:1a-d	9	50:1	34n64
8:53a	9	51:59	34n65
12	10	Ezek	23, 26, 446
12:24a-z	8	16:4	465
16:28a-h	8	Minor Prophets	23
4 Kgdms	23	Ps	23, 437, 446
Isa	23, 26, 439, 446	96 (LXX 95):10	464
7:14	468	110 (LXX 109):1	465
8:1	413	151	352, 360
8:3	413	Prov	23, 26, 439, 446
9:11	420	Job	23, 446
10:9	421	Cant	437
23:2	419	1:7	454
26:17	466	Ruth	23, 437
27:4	466	Lam	23, 437
27:12	421	Eccl	23, 436
33:9	422	Esth	7, 9, 26, 50, 212, 436
37:38	422	1:5	11
40:3	461	1:5-6	11
43:3	419	1:10	11
45:1	465	1:11	11
46:1	422	2:7	11n24
49:12	422	2:20	11
53:12	465	2:23	11
Jer	16n42, 23, 26, 446	3:10	11
20:2	34n64	4:8	11
25:2	34n64	6:13	11
27-29	33	8:6	11
28:1	34n66	8:7	11
28:12	33n63	9:24	11
29-Bar 3:8	25		
31:1	510		

- Esth (*cont.*)
- C 27–28 11n24
- E 10 11
- Dan 7, 8, 26, 50, 212, 440
- 3:34c 12n31
- 4–6 11
- 4 12
- 4:14a (17a) 13, 16
- 4:25 13
- 5 16
- 5:1 13
- 6:26–27 13
- 11:30 422
- Ezr–Neh 23
- 1–2 Chr 23, 440
- 1 Esdras 7n10
- Judith 438
- Tobit 438, 440
- 1 Macc 7n23, 438
- 2 Macc 440
- 3 Macc 440
- 4 Macc 505n7
- Wisdom of Solomon 440
- Sir 439n48
- Baruch 17, 446
- LXX^{Luc} 16, 137n30, 142, 217n51, 260, 308, 355, 357–359, 362
- Early Greek Sources**
- kaige*-Th 17, 23, 24, 26, 43, 82, 87, 88, 322, 357, 362, 436, 437, 443, 459–462, 506
- P.Fouad 266a–c 432n13
- 266b 326n6
- P.Ryl. Gk. 458 432n13
- 4QpapLXXLev^b 292, 454n25
- 4QLXXNum 292
- 4QLXXDeut 292
- 8HevXIIgr 341, 340, 341, 347, 348, 366, 462
- Peshitta** 4, 16, 20, 21, 27, 35, 83n4, 85, 86, 129, 161, 172n27, 191, 225, 261, 298, 322, 323, 449
- Vulgate** 4–6, 20, 83n4, 87, 102, 191, 225, 261, 298, 323, 449, 468
- Targumim** 4, 22n6, 27, 28, 48, 83–86, 92, 191, 225, 243, 261, 298, 322, 323, 432n12, 451
- Onkelos 43, 44, 84, 243, 451
- Neophyti 243
- Pseudo-Jonathan 243, 501
- Jonathan 84, 451
- Job 84, 94n47
- Targum Rishon 11n24
- Targum Sheni 11n24
- Rabbinic Literature**
- Mishna*
- Yom. 1.6 319n31
- Meg. 1.8 433n14
- 2.1 433n14
- 2.2 162
- Moed Qatan 3.4 319n29
- Kel. 15.6 319n29
- Tosepta*
- Meg. 4.13 433n14
- Palestinian Talmud*
- Ta'an. 4.68a 157n11
- Meg. 1.11 (71c) 450n8
- 1.71c 3n1
- 1.71d 159n15, 159n17, 159n18, 162, 276n43, 283n73
- Sanh. 2.20c 319n29
- Midrashim and Minor Tractates*
- Sof. 158, 161
- 1.7 450
- 1.8 159n16
- 1.15 163n30
- 2.5 159n15, 159n17
- 3.8 159n19
- 3.10 3n1
- 12.10 335

Massekhet Sefer Torah	
	158n15, 283n73
Megillat Ta'anit Batra	
	451
<i>Babylonian Talmud</i>	
Shabb.	
10b	451n9
64a	451n9
Yoma	
69a–b	319n29
Meg.	
13a	11n24
Ketub.	
106a	320
Gittin	
68b	451n9
Qiddushin	
30a	246
B. Bat.	
14b–15a	161, 319n29
Menah.	
29b	3n1
30a	158n15
31b	276n43
New Testament	
Matt	
1:21	457
1:22	457n40
1:23	457
3:3	461
11:25	456
2:11	466
1:3	461
Luk	
1:31	457
2:7	457
2:30	466
10:21	456
John	
1:45	457n40
5:46	457n40
1 Cor	
15:3	457n40
15:54	460
Hebr	
10:5–6	464

Non-Biblical Manuscripts from the Judean Desert	
1–4QMilhamah	65
1–4QDamasus Document	
	65
1QapocrGen	14, 247
1QpHab	218, 277n46, 278, 283
1QH ^a	40, 274, 275, 326n4, 340,
	368–386
1QS	65, 162n29, 278
1QSa	162n29
1QSB	162n29
2QSir	326, 328
4–11QTemple	18, 18n46, 85, 205, 212,
	247, 310n50, 361
4Qapocryphon of Moses	
	247
4QBarkhi Nafshi	326n4
4QBerakhot	207
4QMMT	291
4QpaleoParaJoshua (4Q123)	
	342n30
4QPhyl A–K, B–G, J	
	245n25
4QPhyl J (4Q137)	40
4QMez A (4Q149)	
	245n25
4QtgLev (4Q156)	292
4QRP (4Q158, 364–367)	
	13, 18, 19, 45, 47, 47n9, 48,
	49, 51, 52, 54, 56, 71, 212,
	245, 245n22, 248, 309, 349
4QRP ^a (4Q158)	47, 53, 54, 362n38, 388,
	392, 394
4QvisSam (4Q160)	
	71
4QpIsa ^b (4Q161)	218
4QpHos ^b (4Q167)	
	274
4QpMic(?) (4Q168)	
	206n6
4QpNah (4Q169)	218n53, 219
4QTest (4Q175)	39, 54, 142, 247, 267, 310,
	361, 380, 386, 393
4QTanh (4Q176)	219n58
4QCatena ^a (4Q177)	
	208n18
4QSapiential Work (4Q185)	
	385

- 4QpapJub^h (4Q223–224)
216n45
- 4Qpap cryptA Midrash Sefer Moshe
(4Q249) 281
- 4QComm Gen A (4Q252)
219, 219n58, 238, 247
- 4QComm Gen B (4Q253)
219n58
- 4QComm Mal (4Q253a)
219n58
- 4QComm Gen C (4Q254)
219n58
- 4QComm Gen D (4Q254a)
219n58
- 4Qs^b (4Q256) 273
- 4Qs^d (4Q258) 271, 273
- 4Qs^e (4Q259) 273
- 4QD^a (4Q266) 40
- 4QPurification Liturgy (4Q284)
207
- 4QcryptA Words of the Maskil to All Sons
of Dawn (4Q298)
277n45, 281
- 4QExercitium Calami C (4Q341)
290
- 4Q342–348 293
- 4QpapDeed F ar (4Q347)
293
- 4Q351–361 293
- 4QRP^b (4Q364) 19n48, 53–57, 57n46,
244n20, 390n9, 393, 394
- 4QRP^c (4Q365) 47, 48, 53–57, 57n46, 310,
327, 394
- 4QTemple? (4Q365a)
310n50
- 4QRP^d (4Q366) 53, 56
- 4QRP^e (4Q367) 53, 56
- 4QapocrPent. A (4Q368)
277n45
- 4QNarrative and Poetic Composition^b
(4Q372) 388
- 4QapocrJosh^a (4Q378)
40, 385
- 4QapocrJosh^b (4Q379)
142, 151
- 4QNon-Canonical Psalms A (4Q380)
326n4
- 4QNon-Canonical Psalms B (4Q381)
326n4
- 4QShirShabb (4Q400–407)
326n4
- 4QComp. conc. Div. Provid. (4Q413)
276
- 4QSapiential-Hymnic Work A (4Q426)
71
- 4QH^a (4Q427) 378n20
- 4QDibHam^a (4Q504)
71, 207
- 4QprFêtes (4Q507–509)
207
- 4QpapPrFêtes^c (4Q509)
267
- 4QMessianic Apocalypse (4Q521)
316, 326, 328
- 4QProphecy of Joshua (4Q522)
289
- 4QT^b (4Q524) 71
- 4QTQahat (4Q542)
270
- 4QpapBibChronology ar (4Q559)
238
- 11QShirShabb 283
- 11QT^a 14, 18, 40, 47, 52, 56, 57,
57n46, 213, 217, 273, 283,
284, 284n74, 311
- 11QT^b 45
- XQPhyl 3 245n25
- MasSir 326, 328
- CD 145, 155
- XHEv/Se 32 293
- Various**
- Barnabas
XII.11 465
- Enoch 247
- Ecclesiasticus 326, 439
- Epiphanius
De mensuris et ponderibus §3, 6
431
- Epistle of Aristean 430, 443, 450n7, 452, 467,
467n90
- Herodotus
I.178 423
I.185 423
I.189 418

11.3	417	Ketef Hinnom amulets	
11.7	417		207
11.59	417	Pap. Nash	207, 246, 339
11.66	419	Philo	
11.157	418, 419	<i>Hypoth.</i>	
V.49	418	7.13	433n14, 505n7
Hesiod		<i>Moses</i>	
<i>Theog.</i>		2.215	505n7
338	420	<i>Prob.</i>	
Josephus		81–82	433n14, 505n7
<i>Ant.</i>	14n35, 359n22	<i>Vit. Mos.</i>	
1.3.6 §93	422n42	2.37	467
5.16–20	149n59	2.215	433n14
11.184–296	10	Polybius	
Jubilees	14, 18, 55–57, 216, 217, 238, 247	V.44.6	417
Justin Martyr		Pseudo-Philo	
<i>Apologia</i>	4–6, 430	<i>Biblical Antiquities</i>	
<i>Dialogue with Trypho</i>		14n35, 151n69, 217	
430, 457n41, 464n80		Severus Scroll	241
		Siloam inscription	38n4

Index of Authors

- Abegg, M.G. 49n16, 49n18, 97n4, 203n46, 300n10, 302, 369n2, 381n24
- Aejmelaesus, A. 478n15, 505n6, 51n26, 514n38
- Ahituv, S. 342n30
- Albertz, R. 12n26
- Albrektson, B. 35n71, 85n15
- Albright, W.F. 351n84
- Alexander, P.S. 63n9
- Allegro, J.M. 45, 290n5
- Allen, L.C. 440n53
- Amit, Y. 352n91
- Andersen, F.I. 38n2, 95, 95n1, 96, 96n3, 98, 100n12, 244n18, 313n1
- Aptowitzer, V. 432n10, 453n20
- Attridge, H.W. 464n77
- Atwill, J. 271n21
- Auld, A.G. 137n29, 140n36
- Baab, O.J. 505n6, 51n27
- Baillet, M. 363, 387, 387n2
- Baker, D.B. 420n30
- Banning, J.H.A. van 102n1
- Bar-Asher, M. 348
- Bar-Efrat, S. 342n30
- Bar-Gal, G. 274n31
- Barns, J.W.B. 280n65
- Barr, J. 96n3, 100n12, 157n9, 202n45, 372n10, 372n12, 444n74, 447n88, 490n3, 496n13, 504n3, 507n12
- Barthélemy, D. 23n8, 23n9, 24, 24n14, 24n17, 291, 302n22, 436n27, 437n28, 437n29, 437n30, 437n31, 437n34, 438n43, 451n12
- Baruchi, Y. 315n10, 341n25
- Baudissin, W.W. Graf von 486n23
- Baumgärtel, F. 428n56
- Baumgartner, A.J. 86n24
- Baumgartner, W. 189n3, 195
- Beale, G.K. 460n56
- Bearman, G. 277n47, 278n53, 278n54, 279n58
- Beattie, D.R.G. 89n36
- Beckwith, R. 319n29
- Begg, C. 151n69
- Ben-Dov, J. 32n51, 350
- Ben-Hayyim, Z. 252, 254, 255, 257, 389n7
- Benoit, P. 267n1, 466n89
- Berlin, A. 107
- Bernstein, M.J. 44n16, 46n6, 52n23, 52n27, 219n60, 388n5
- Bertram, G. 440n59, 455n28
- Beyerle, S. 361n37
- Bickerman, E.J. 436n24, 436n25, 438n40
- Birnbaum, S.A. 323n43
- Birt, Th. 25n24
- Blau, L. 104n5, 320n36
- Bloch, J. 27n30
- Bodine, W.R. 259n1
- Boer, P.A.H. de 84n14, 85n18
- Bonani, G. 270n15
- Booras, S.W. 278n54
- Borbone, P.G. 122n8, 127n24
- Bowley, J.E. 49n16
- Bowman, J. 387n3
- Brady, M. 277n45
- Braunheim, S. 271n21
- Brayford, S. 172n28
- Breuer, M. 325n1
- Briggs, C.A. 189
- Brizemeure, D. 279n57
- Brockington, L.H. 455n32, 456n38
- Brooke, G.J. 14n34, 46n6, 52n27, 55n41, 154n1, 212n34, 218, 218n52, 242n12, 463n69
- Broshi, M. 268n8, 270n15, 271n22, 274n32, 337n1
- Brown, F. 189
- Brown, W.P. 170n21
- Brownlee, W.H. 10n21, 218n54, 277n45, 369n2
- Budde, K. 131n43
- Buhl, F. 194, 198–202
- Burrows, M. 277n45
- Burton, D. 272n24
- Cabries, D.M. 278n54
- Cappellus, L. 193, 354
- Carbajosa, I. 85n18, 86n20, 86n22, 86n24
- Carmi, I. 271n22
- Carmignac, J. 376n19
- Carr, D.M. 248n37

- Case, S.J. 456n37
 Castellus, E. 252
 Catastini, A. 122n8
 Charles, R.H. 238n23
 Charlesworth, J.H. 270n15, 279n56, 290n7
 Chazon, E.G. 207n9, 282n71, 378n20
 Childs, B.S. 469n99
 Churgin, P. 453n18
 Clifford, R.J. 87n25
 Clines, D.J.A. 10n19, 190, 196–198, 200, 202
 Cohen, A. 158n14
 Cohen, G.H. 108n18
 Cohen, M. 158n12
 Cohen, N.G. 415n18
 Collin, M. 219n57
 Collins, J.J. 12n28, 212n37
 Collins, N.L. 504n2
 Colson, F.H. 439n44
 Cook, E.M. 49n16, 49n18
 Cook, J. 169n15, 170n20, 369n2, 369n3, 434n19, 478n15
 Cornill, C.H. 122n4, 128
 Crawford, S.W. 45, 47n7, 54n36, 56, 56n42, 123n11, 126n20, 128n32, 130n42, 212n34, 242n12, 310n50, 389n6, 406n44, 406n47, 407n50
 Cross, F.M. 28n34, 35n71, 155n3, 277n48, 280n61, 304n31, 308n46, 344n42, 354n1, 354n5, 355n6, 357, 358n19, 359, 359n26, 362n39, 398n34, 406n46
 Crowfoot, G.M. 268n4
 Crown, A.D. 137n28, 160n20

 Dahmen, U. 210n28
 Dahse, J. 488n28
 Daniel, S. 512n32
 Davila, J.R. 52n26, 292n14
 Day, J. 30n40
 Delekat, L. 86n23
 Demsky, A. 74n32, 198n37
 De Troyer, K. 139n34, 149n62, 152
 den Hertog, C.G. 134n10, 447n86, 504n5
 Dexinger, F. 388n4, 389n6
 Dietrich, F.E.C. 194
 Díez Merino, L. 89n36
 Dimant, D. 294n22, 348
 Dines, J.M. 458n45
 Dirksen, P.B. 27n29, 86n22

 Dogniez, C. 413n2, 458n45
 Donner, H. 194
 Dorival, G. 169n13, 408n54, 434n20, 437n28, 438n37, 438n39, 439n46, 439n47, 439n49, 440n56, 441n65, 443n69, 443n72, 446n83, 477n11
 Dorothy, C.V. 9n18
 Dotan, A. 107n10, 118n25
 Doudna, G. 270n13, 271
 Driver, S.R. 83, 84n14, 85n18, 189, 199n40
 Dubarle, A.M. 467n89
 Duncan, J.A. 208n16, 329, 361n33

 Easton, R.L. 279n56
 Ehrman, B.D. 462n68
 Eichhorn, J.G. 73n25, 83, 351
 Eidsvåg, G.M. 417n22
 Eisenman, R.H. 289n3
 Eissfeldt, O. 440n59, 297n1
 Elgvin, T. 276, 276n41
 Elliger, K. 219n56
 Emerton, J. 490n3, 499n25
 Esh, S. 323n42
 Eshel, E. 168n9, 198n37, 246n27, 248n37, 249, 341n26, 345, 351, 389n6, 405n43
 Eshel, H. 64n12, 270n15, 315n10, 341n26, 351, 389n6

 Fabry, H.-J. 154n1
 Falk, D.K. 50n19, 212n34
 Fassberg, S. 368n1
 Fassberg, S.E. 158n12
 Feldman, A. 153n80
 Fernández Marcos, N. 258, 413n5, 458n45, 462n66
 Festugière, A.-J. 440n60
 Fields, W.W. 294n21
 Figueras, P. 421n39
 Fischer, G. 76n45
 Fischer, J. 428n56
 Flesher, P.V.M. 86n22
 Flint, P.W. 32n52, 48n11, 208n18, 278n49, 287, 287n77, 296n29, 311
 Florentin, M. 172n28, 250, 307n44, 389n7
 Forbes, A.D. 38n2, 95, 95n1, 96, 96n3, 98, 100n12, 244n18
 Fox, M.V. 123n11
 Frankel, Z. 168n7, 170n19, 188n34, 432n9, 453n19, 478n14

- Frankl, P.F. 86n25
 Freedman, D.N. 313n1, 359n29
 Fuks, A. 438n42
 Fürst, J. 432n9, 453n19
- Gall, F. von 250
 Gamble, H.Y. 25n24
 Ganzfried, S. 158n13
 Garbini, G. 122n8, 302n22
 García Martínez, F. 45, 49n17, 206n4, 295n27, 339n8, 355n7
 Gaster, M. 136n25, 136n26, 151n70
 Geiger, A. 21n4, 497n19
 Gelston, A. 85n18
 Gerleman, G. 107, 119, 439n50
 Gese, H. 30n41
 Gesenius, W. 168n7, 189, 407n51, 500n28
 Gibbs, J.W. 194n24
 Giese, R.L. 369n2
 Ginsburg, C.D. 107
 Goodblatt, D. 318n27
 Gooding, D.W. 8, 8n12, 433n17
 Gordis, R. 157n11
 Görg, M. 434n22
 Gorski, A. 277n46
 Goshen-Gottstein, M.H. 48n11, 85n15, 88n33, 129n35, 342n32, 351n89, 368n1, 452n14, 502n34
 Gottlieb, L. 345n53
 Goulder, M.D. 31n45
 Gray, J. 84n7
 Green, D. 271n21
 Green, E. 418n24
 Greenberg, G. 85n18, 87n25
 Greenspoon, L. 462n67
 Greenstein, E.L. 323n42
 Greg, W.W. 128n29
 Grelot, R. 12n28
 Grossfeld, B. 11n24
 Gzella, H. 438n37
- Hahn, O. 274n33, 275n39
 Hall, F.W. 25n24
 Haran, M. 48n11, 73n29, 275n37, 351n89
 Harford, J.B. 488n27
 Harkins, A.K. 378n21
 Harl, M. 172n28, 434n21, 455n30, 456n37, 458n45, 467n89, 489n32, 514n39
 Harrington, D.J. 14n34, 47n6
- Haupt, P. 122
 Heller, Ch. 169n16
 Hendel, R.S. 122n8, 123n11, 124, 124n14, 126n19, 127n26, 131n44, 163n36, 169n11, 170n17, 187n32, 217, 217n49, 222n2, 225n6, 225n7, 229n9, 237n21, 408n54, 470n1, 482n20, 486n23, 488n27, 490n1
 Hengel, M. 430n2, 430n4, 436n26, 438n38, 438n40, 440n54, 441n61, 443n69, 454n25, 458n44, 464n79, 468, 468n95
 Herbert, E.D. 357n15
 Herrmann, J. 428n56
 Higger, M. 158n14
 Higham, T. 271n21
 Hiltunen, C.L. 395n31
 Hjelm, I. 387n1
 Hoffman, Y. 342n30
 Hognesius, K. 123n8, 124, 124n15
 Holladay, C.R. 459n49
 Holladay, W.L. 76n44
 Hollenberg, J. 133n3
 Holm-Nielsen, S. 376n19
 Holmes, S. 137n29, 140n36, 143n42, 144n46
 Honigman, S. 431n7
 Hoop, R. de 490n3
 Horbury, W. 438n42
 Hort, F.J.A. 205n1
 Hossfeld, F.L. 32n51
 Houbigant, A.F. 193n20, 354
 Hugo, Ph. 359n25
 Hurvitz, A. 21n5
 Hyvärinen, K. 436n27
- Isenberg, S. 86n22
- Jacob, B. 87n29, 88n32, 436n25
 Janzen, J.G. 25n21, 34n65
 Japhet, S. 7n10
 Jastram, N. 248n36, 277n45, 392n20, 403
 Jeansonne, S.P. 12n27
 Jellicoe, S. 506n9
 Jepsen, A. 237n21
 Joffe, L. 30n41, 31n47, 31n49
 Johannessohn, M. 136n22, 455n31
 Johnston, R. 279n56
 Jones, A.H.M. 426n53
 Joosten, J. 123n11, 126n20, 128n32, 129, 129n37, 130n42, 203n48, 434n21, 507n11
 Jull, A.J.T. 270n15, 286n76

- Kahila Bar-Gal, G. 273, 286, 288n78
 Kahle, P. 107n12, 136n27, 219n56, 242
 Kartveit, M. 243n16, 390n8, 390n9, 391n12, 391n16, 392n20, 393n24
 Kasher, R. 76n41, 342n30
 Katz, P. 443n68
 Kautsch, E. 189
 Kedar-Kopfstein, B. 87n26, 87n28, 87n29
 Kennedy, H.A.A. 455n30
 Kenney, E.J. 124n13
 Kenyon, F.G. 25n24
 Kim, A.Y. 54n38, 309n49, 393n25
 Kim, Hayeon 444n73, 447n85, 504n4, 505n6, 512n28
 Kim, Jong-Hoon 24n20
 Kim, K.-R. 163n35, 169n14, 407n53, 477n11
 Kiraz, G.A. 294n21
 Kisch, G. 151n69
 Kister, M. 281n70
 Kittel, R. 31n43, 107n12
 Kleer, M. 210n28
 Knoppers, G. 131n44
 Knox, K. 279n56
 Knox, W.L. 438n44
 Koch, D.-A. 458n46, 459n50, 460n52, 461n57
 Koehler, L. 189n3, 195
 König, E. 189
 Koenig, J. 395n32
 Koenig, Y. 435n22
 Kohn, S. 168n7
 Komlos, Y. 84n11, 84n14
 Kooij, A. van der 5n5, 28n32, 58n48, 413n3, 419n27, 420n30, 421n37, 428n56, 429n1, 463n69
 Kraft, R.A. 454n24, 454n26, 463n73, 464n75
 Kranz, D.K. 455n28, 467n89, 468n96
 Kratz, R. 192n10
 Kraus, H.-J. 30n41
 Krause, J.J. 153n78
 Krauss, S. 319n32, 320n36
 Kuenen, A. 237n21
 Kugel, J. 325n2
 Kuhl, C. 369n2
 Kutscher, E.Y. 33n59, 368n1, 369n3
 Lamsa, G.M. 201n1, 449n2
 Lange, A. 501n9, 209n22, 219n59, 279n58, 293n16, 356n10, 358n20, 363n43
 Langlamet, F. 106n6
 Larcher, G. 440n58
 Lee, J.A.L. 434n21, 439n46, 442n66
 Lemmelijn, B. 389n6
 Leo, C. 194n24
 Levita, Elias 38n2
 Lichtenberger, H. 460n56
 Lieberman, S. 201n44, 319n32
 Liebmann, E. 466n86
 Lifshitz, B. 340
 Lightfoot, J. 252
 Lim, T.H. 219n54, 238n23
 Lohfink, N. 73n24
 Louw, Th. van der 504n2
 Lund, J.A. 86n23
 Lundberg, M.J. 279n55
 Lust, J. 443n69
 Luzzatto, S.D. 198n36
 Macuch, R. 490n3
 Magen, Y. 274n31
 Magness, J. 61n5
 Maori, Y. 27n29, 85n15, 86n19
 Marcus, R. 436n24, 440n59
 Margolis, M.L. 136n24
 Marks, J.H. 87n27, 87n29
 Martin, M. 369n3, 370n6, 376n16, 384n27
 Martone, C. 361n32
 Mašić, A. 272, 272n23
 Massingberd Ford, J. 388n4
 Mazor, L. 29n36, 133n8, 135n16, 135n19, 137n29, 142n41, 144n50, 349
 McCarter, P.K. 28n33, 297n3, 358n15
 McGlinchey, J.M. 439n50
 McKane, W. 87n27
 McLay, R.T. 456n36, 457n39, 458n45
 McNamara, M.J. 89n36
 Meer, M.N. van der 134n15, 135n20, 137n31, 138n31, 139n34, 149n63, 150n65, 418n26
 Melamed, E.Z. 451n14
 Menken, M.J.J. 459n47, 459n48, 460n52, 460n54, 461n61, 461n63
 Meyer, R. 194, 202
 Michael, T.S.L. 25n21

- Michaelis, C.B.W. 19n8
 Michaelis, J.D. 191, 193n20
 Milik, J.T. 267n3, 353n1
 Millard, A.R. 35n72, 74n30
 Miller, E.F. 194n21
 Miller, J.W. 76n43
 Moatti-Fine, J. 133n7
 Molin, G. 218n52
 Montgomery, J.A. 12n29, 87n27
 Morag, S. 368n1
 Morenz, S. 434n22
 Morgenstern, M. 341n23
 Morinus, J. 193
 Morrison, C.E. 85n18
 Moulton, J.H. 51n25
 Mühlau, F. 194
 Mulder, M.J. 85n15
 Müller, M. 450n5, 469n98
 Munnich, O. 12n26, 437n37
 Muraoka, T. 41n9
 Murtonen, A. 244n18
 Mussies, G. 438n40

 Nakman, D. 310n53, 345
 Nam, R.S. 54n34
 Naveh, J. 290n8
 New, D.S. 460n55
 Newsom, C. 151n71
 Nickelsburg, G.W.E. 337n3
 Nir-El, Y. 274n32, 275n34
 Nöldeke, T. 101n9
 Noort, E. 136n27, 148n58, 149n63, 152
 Noss, P.A. 102n2
 Noth, M. 369n2
 Nowack, W. 87n28
 Noy, D. 438n42

 O'Loughlin, T. 229n8
 Oesch, J.M. 317n20, 333n16
 Olofsson, S. 361n35
 Omanson, R.L. 102n2
 Oppert, J. 238n25
 Orlinsky, H.M. 137n29, 361n34, 467n91
 Owen, E. 404n40

 Paap, A.H.R.E. 454n25
 Parry, D.W. 28n34, 49n14, 207n10, 269n10,
 280n61, 339n8, 343n36, 347n62, 354n5,
 358n18, 359

 Passoni dell'Acqua, A. 434n21
 Paton, L.B. 436n25
 Paul, S.M. 76n37
 Peleg, Y. 274n31
 Penkower, J.S. 106n7, 118n23
 Perrot, C. 106n6
 Pfann, S.J. 277n45, 277n47, 280n66, 293n18
 Pietersma, A. 437n35
 Pisano, S. 358n21
 Plenderleith, H.J. 275
 Plight, J. van der 271n21
 Ploeg, J.P.M. van der 45, 205n2, 219n56
 Polak, F.H. 447n87, 345n52, 357n13, 358n16,
 510n24
 Polzin, R. 21n5
 Poole, J.B. 268n5, 272n24
 Porat, R. 315n10, 341n26
 Posen, R.B. 44n18
 Prestel, P. 514n39
 Prijs, L. 169n15, 432n9, 453n19, 453n21,
 503n36
 Propp, W.H.C. 362n39
 Puech, É. 221n1, 238, 279n57, 289n1, 376n19
 Pulikottil, P. 369n2, 463n69
 Pummer, R. 137n28

 Qimron, E. 276n40, 289n2, 291n10, 343n36,
 368n1

 Rabin, Ch. 88n33, 343n34, 348
 Rabin, I. 274n33, 275n38
 Rahlfs, A. 22n7, 413, 463n75, 465n81
 Rajak, T. 429n1
 Rasmussen, K.L. 271n21
 Redford, D.B. 419n28
 Redpath, H.A. 417n22
 Reed, R. 268n5, 272n24
 Reed, S.A. 279n55, 293n18, 293n19
 Renz, J. 194
 Rezetko, R. 21n5
 Richards, K.H. 369n2
 Ricks, S.D. 269n10
 Roberts, B.J. 302n22
 Roberts, C.H. 454n24
 Robinson, E. 194n24, 196
 Rofé, A. 6n8, 21n4, 29n36, 137n29, 144n47,
 145, 152, 345n54, 348–350, 357n12
 Rooper, M. 21n5
 Rösel, H.N. 145n54

- Rösel, M. 140n38, 146n54, 169n13, 192n12,
408n54, 432n13, 442n67, 447n89, 457n42,
477n11, 487, 487n24, 487n26, 490n3, 493n8,
494n9, 509n20
- Rosenmüller, E.F.C. 193n20
- Rothstein, D. 310n53
- Rudolph, W. 34n69
- Ryder, M.L. 268n5, 268n7
- Sadaqa, A. 250
- Sadaqa, R. 250
- Safrai, S. 432n9, 453n19
- Saley, R.J. 28n34, 280n61, 308n46, 354n5,
355n6, 356n11, 358n19, 359
- Sanders, J.A. 209n23, 296n29, 360n31
- Sanderson, J.E. 69n18, 275n35, 389n6,
391n14, 402n37
- Sarna, N. 34n67
- Sayce, A.H. 238n25
- Schäfer, R. 240n4
- Schaper, J. 437n36
- Schattner-Rieser, U. 389n6
- Schenker, A. 137n30, 430n3, 446, 450n6
- Schiffman, L.H. 215n42, 247n33, 337n5,
361n36
- Schmitt, A. 514n39
- Schniedewind, W.M. 368n1, 385n28
- Schorch, S. 29n35, 255, 463n72, 514n39
- Schuller, E. 376n17, 378n21, 384n27, 388n5
- Schultens, A. 191, 197
- Schürer, E. 440n56
- Schwartz, B. 489n32
- Schwemer, A.M. 459n49
- Seeligmann, I.L. 29n36, 343, 420n31,
422n44, 433, 433n18, 439n49, 464n75,
465n84, 466n87
- Segal, M. 14n34, 15, 15n36, 46n6, 50,
50n20, 50n21, 52n25, 52n27, 53n30,
55n40, 88n29, 212n34, 243n16, 341n23,
346n57, 348, 349, 352n90, 360n31, 390n8,
390n9
- Segal, M.Z. 342, 342n28
- Segert, S. 219n56
- Shenkel, J.D. 24, 24n15, 24n16, 24n17
- Sickle, J. van 25n24
- Siegel, J.P. 39n6, 380n23
- Siegert, F. 435n22
- Silberman, N.A. 339n10
- Simon, R. 193
- Sinclair, L.A. 219n57
- Skarsaune, O. 431n5
- Skehan, P.W. 275n35, 305n34, 389n6, 391n11,
391n14
- Skinner, J. 170n19, 222n4, 488n27, 489n32,
501n30
- Smith, P. 273
- Soderlund, S. 25n21
- Soisalon-Soininen, I. 516n42, 516n46
- Sollamo, R. 133n6, 136n23, 506n8, 512n31
- Sommer, B. 34n67
- Sparks, W.F.D. 455n29
- Sperber, A. 84, 169n16, 171n22
- Spiro, S.A.I. 277n47, 278n53
- Spurrell, G. 498, 490n3, 501n30, 501n31
- Stade, B. 122, 189n1
- Staerk, W. 459n50
- Steck, O.H. 106n6
- Steckoll, S.H. 274n32
- Stegemann, H. 62n7, 155n2, 282n71, 294n21,
376n17, 378n20, 378n21, 384n27
- Stenhouse, P. 137n28
- Steudel, A. 282n71
- Steuernagel, C. 73n25, 89n37
- Stipp, H.-J. 33n55, 435n23
- Stökl ben Ezra, D. 65n14, 295n23
- Stoll, D. 282n71
- Strugnell, J. 45, 52n26, 271n20, 277n48,
291n10
- Stummer, F. 87n27, 87n29
- Sukenik, E.L. 337, 339, 340n13, 376n19
- Sundberg, A. 443n68
- Swanson, D.D. 46n6
- Swete, H.B. 17n43, 435n23, 436n27, 458n45,
459n50, 463n74
- Sysling, H. 452n14
- Tal, A. 172n28, 250, 251, 307n44, 389n7
- Talmon, S. 48n11, 88n33, 129n34, 299n7,
314n8, 317, 332n12, 341n22, 343n34, 344,
348, 350, 351
- Talshir, Z. 7n10, 350
- Taylor, J.E. 271n21
- Taylor, R.A. 86n24
- Tcherikover, V.A. 438n42
- Tchernov, E. 273
- Thackeray, H.St.J. 24, 24n13, 25n22, 414n12,
417n21, 424n48, 425n49, 435n23, 436n28,
440n51, 440n55, 443n70, 445n79, 455n33

- Thenius, O. 28n31
 Thiessen, M. 388n5
 Thomas, K.J. 459n50
 Thordson, Th. & M. 387n1
 Tigay, J.H. 15n38, 357n12
 Tigchelaar, E.J.C. 41n8, 49n17, 280n63, 326n6, 347n62
 Tilly, M. 447n90
 Toepler, Th.E. 168n7
 Torrey, C.C. 131n43
 Tov, E. 8n11, 10n22, 10n23, 11n23, 11n25, 13n32, 14n33, 14n34, 15n37, 17n45, 24n18, 25n22, 25n23, 26n26, 26n27, 26n28, 31n44, 44n17, 47n6, 47n7, 49n13, 49n14, 53n28, 54n35, 54n36, 74n33, 75n36, 88n33, 95n1, 133n5, 137n29, 151n71, 163n36, 169n12, 171n23, 188n32, 196n28, 207n10, 215n41, 243n14, 274n32, 278n53, 293n20, 298n4, 310n50, 317n24, 318n26, 341n21, 341n27, 346n58, 347–349, 355n7, 356n11, 357n14, 361n37, 379n22, 390n8, 393n24, 409n55, 425n49, 433n17, 437n28, 443n72, 446n81, 447n91, 450n6, 451n11, 454n25, 516n45
 Traube, L. 454n25
 Treat, J.C. 454n27
 Trebolle Barrera, J. 137n30, 349n73
 Tregelles, S.P. 194n24, 196
 Treu, K. 454n25
 Trever, J.C. 277n45, 337n2
 Troxel, R.L. 415n15, 420n31, 421n37, 439n49
 Trudinger, L.P. 460n56
 Tsevat, M. 29n35
 Turner, N. 455n30, 455n34, 511n25
 Turner, P.D.M. 25n22, 425n49

 Ulrich, E. 12n27, 12n30, 28n34, 49n12, 50, 50n19, 123n11, 126n20, 128n32, 130n42, 148, 148n57, 148n58, 210n25, 211n30, 211n32, 229n9, 275n35, 291, 298n4, 305n34, 311n54, 313n2, 355n6, 359n22, 362n41, 389n6, 390n8, 391n14, 463n69, 476n8

 VanderKam, J.C. 217, 217n45, 217n47, 238n23, 247n35, 277n45, 278n49, 287, 287n77, 406n49
 Van Rooy, H.F. 85n18, 123n11, 128n31, 130n39
 Vaux, R. de 61n5, 267n1

 Veltri, G. 451n10
 Venetz, H.J. 437n32, 437n34
 Volck, W. 194

 Waard, J. de 458n45
 Wacholder, B.Z. 52n24, 210n28, 238n24, 438n38, 439n45, 440n61, 441n63, 441n64
 Wallenstein, M. 323n41
 Walters, P. 495n12
 Walton, B. 252
 Wasserstein, A. 430n2, 433n14, 439n47, 467n94
 Wasserstein, D. 430n2, 433n14, 439n47, 467n94
 Water, R. van der 271n21
 Webster, B. 61n6, 269n11, 314n5, 326n7
 Weinfeld, M. 208n16
 Weiser, A. 32n51
 Weiss, R. 84n7, 345
 Weitzman, M.P. 27n29, 27n30, 85n16, 85n18, 86n21
 Wellhausen, J. 28, 29n37, 83, 84n14, 88n29, 199n40, 354
 Wendland, P. 452n16
 Wenham, G.J. 221n1, 226n7
 Wenthe, D.O. 12n27
 West, M.L. 121n3
 Westcott, B.F. 205n1
 Westermann, C. 490n3
 Wevers, J.W. 170n18, 172n28, 482n19, 488n29, 495n11
 Wiener, H.M. 488n27
 Wifstrand, A. 516n43
 Wildberger, H. 198n37
 Wilk, F. 460n52, 461n60
 Williamson, H.G.M. 128n30
 Wilson, G.H. 31n48, 209n24, 210n28, 296n29
 Wise, M.O. 49n18, 289n3, 295n26
 Woodward, S.R. 267n2, 273, 274n30, 286
 Woude, A.S. van der 5n6, 45, 206n3
 Wright, B.G. 133n5
 Wright, R.M. 21n5

 Yadin, Y. 52, 159n15, 214n39, 245n25, 337n4, 339, 340n15, 341, 341n18
 Yardeni, A. 293n17, 379n22
 Yizhar, M. 339n7
 Young, I. 4n3, 21n5, 74n32, 156n4, 300n10, 301n19, 315n14, 316n18

Zahn, M.M. 212n34, 243n16, 389n6, 390n8,
390n9, 394n30, 405n42
Zakovitch, Y. 236n20, 350
Ziegler, J. 26n25, 361n34, 421n39, 427n54,
439n49, 464n75, 465n83

Ziemer, B. 237n21
Zimmerli, W. 76n42
Zipor, M.A. 11n24, 490n3
Zuckerman, B. 277n47, 278, 279n55

